

A HISTORY OF UNIVERSITY REFORM

FROM 1800 A.D. TO THE PRESENT TIME

WITH SUGGESTIONS TOWARDS A COMPLETE
SCHEME FOR THE UNIVERSITY
OF CAMBRIDGE

BY

A. I. TILLYARD, M.A.,

St. John's College, Cambridge

CAMBRIDGE :

W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.

1913

LA⁶³⁶
T5

205671

25/

PREFACE.

A few words of explanation may be given as to how this book came to be written. In July, 1907, Bishop Gore raised a discussion in the House of Lords on University Reform, and so brought the question prominently forward. I spent the summer of that year in thinking out and writing down my own ideas on it. In October an outline of them was published in *The Cambridge Independent Press* and also in the now defunct London daily paper, *The Tribune*. It then occurred to me that it might be of advantage if an account of the views held by those who had advocated reform in the past, and of the main changes effected by legislation, could be put into the hands of the public. The present volume is the result. I have discovered to my great satisfaction how little originality there was in my suggestions. The germs of the chief of them had been in print for many years, though at the time I did not know it.

The task of writing the book has not been easy, because two classes of persons have had to be borne in mind—those who know Oxford and Cambridge from within, and those who, though interested in education, have never been through either the one or the other. To give this latter class full explanations on every point of difficulty as it arose in connexion with two very complex institutions would have required a separate

volume, but an effort has been made to meet their case. It is for their benefit that the introductory chapter has been compiled, and if the unacademical reader will study that carefully and then go forward in patience, he will find things falling gradually into their places, and ought to finish with a fairly good conception both of the history of the Universities and also of their present condition.

A further word of explanation may be given of my own particular standpoint. It has been my fortune ever since the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 to be associated with the public administration of Secondary Education. The question therefore which interests me most is how the ancient Universities can best be fitted into our present educational system. I have not attempted to chronicle all the many internal changes which Oxford and Cambridge have brought about by their own action, but have sought rather to trace the course which criticism, more or less detached, has taken, and to tell of the reforms which have been effected by the external action of Parliament. I may add that though I have taken a degree at Cambridge and have lived for more than forty years within the statutory mile and a half of Great St. Mary's Church, I have never held any University or College office. To that extent I have written as an outsider. As regards Oxford I am an outsider altogether. There is no possibility of concealing my consequent shortcomings from the initiated, and I crave their indulgence accordingly.

The suggestions towards a complete scheme of reform for the University of Cambridge will, I trust, not be

looked upon as unpardonably presumptuous, because a complete scheme seems now the one thing needful. Legislation in 1854 and in subsequent years proceeded on practical English lines, that is to say it dealt with obvious abuses and deficiencies, and avoided as far as possible decisions on questions of principle. But the obvious abuses are nearly all gone. Both the University and the Colleges are trying to do their best, and if the result is not all that could be desired, it is because they are struggling with a bad system. If Parliament is prepared only to deal with abuses, it is questionable whether it is worth its while interfering. What is wanted is that reformers should have an ideal and see how far Oxford and Cambridge can be brought up to it. Are there not still, in Mark Pattison's words, some "University men who betray rather an impression that something should be done, than a reasoned conviction as to what that something is"? If my suggestions do no more than provoke criticism and so help to clarify opinion, they will not have been put forward in vain.

A. I. TILLYARD.

Fordfield, Cambridge,

June 23rd, 1913.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Legal definition of the Universities—Their earliest form—Origin of—Mullinger's picture of in 1150 A.D.—Youthful undergraduates—Arts and Faculties—Degrees—Latin and Greek—Teaching and Examinations—The Professoriate—Regents and Non-Regents—The Chancellor—The Vice-Chancellor—The Proctors—A picture of Convocation—The foundation of the Colleges—New College and King's College—The idea of a College—Scholars—Fellows—Masters—College Statutes—The rule of study—The rule of life—Visitors—Growth of the Collegiate system—The Elizabethan Revolution—The *Caput Senatus*—Action of James the First—The Laudian Statutes—Their result—Goldwin Smith's statement—Vicissitudes of fortune—Effects of the Reformation—The Restoration and after—Cambridge in 1800—Oxford in 1800 - - - - Pages 1-18

CHAPTER II.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CRITICISM.

Cardinal Newman's account—First attack by the *Edinburgh Review*—Espriella's "Letters from England"—Review of La Place's "Mecanique Celeste"—Review of Strabo—Review of Edgeworth's "Essays on Professional Education"—Copleston's Reply—Mr. T. E. Kebbel's views—Criticism thereof—Copleston's account of the Oxford Examinations—Dr. Jebb's account of the Cambridge Examinations - - - - 19-36

CHAPTER III.

THE SECOND ATTACK BY THE *EDINBURGH REVIEW*.

Sir William Hamilton at Oxford—His Articles and Appendix—Encounter with Whewell—Analysis of Hamilton's Article of June, 1831—Employment of the historical method—The University of Oxford—The Colleges—The Oxford System *de jure*—The Professors—The Tutorial System—The System *de facto*—The transition from the legal to the illegal system—Effected by the Colleges—The action of Laud—The Remedy—Reply and Counter-reply—Admission of Dissenters—The Appendix—Oxford as it is—Oxford as it might be—The ends of a University—Things primary—Things secondary—Action in the House of Lords—Action in the House of Commons—Mark Pattison's criticism of Hamilton—Goldwin Smith's views—Hamilton's charge of illegality—Dean Peacock's account—Hamilton's merits—He is the Father of University Reform—First hint of the University Extension movement - - - 37-68

CHAPTER IV.

UNIVERSITY *v.* COLLEGES (CAMBRIDGE).

Cardinal Newman on the controversy—Sir Charles Lyell—His “Travels in North America”—Incidental attack on the College system—Science exiled from the Universities—Criticism of Whewell—Whewell replies to Lyell—Opposes a Royal Commission—A Cambridge pamphlet, “The Next Step”—Co-operation between Colleges and University desirable—Wratislaw’s “Observations on the Cambridge system”—Suggestion of the Common University Fund—College system corrupt and exclusive—Donaldson upholds Hamilton and Wratislaw—Condemns subordination of University to Colleges—Higher standard for admission necessary - - - 69-92

CHAPTER V.

UNIVERSITY *v.* COLLEGES (OXFORD).

Professorial Lecture *v.* Tutorial Class—Copleston’s view—Hamilton’s view—Pusey and H. H. Vaughan—Bonamy Price’s first pamphlet—Excessive labour imposed on Tutors—Best men leave the University—No provision for learning—A scheme propounded—Bonamy Price’s second pamphlet—What are University requirements?—The best men still leaving—The promotion of Research—Unsatisfactory position of the Professors—And of College Tutors—University education in the hands of young men—Teaching and fees should belong to the University—A Graduated Professoriate—Tutorial functions to be left to the Colleges—Newman’s verdict—University has no jurisdiction over the Colleges—Want of Entrance Examinations—Goldwin Smith’s view—Mark Pattison’s view - - 83-99

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION OF 1850.

Results of fifty years agitation—Spread of Competitive Examinations—Their origin—Mr. Christie’s motions in 1844 and 1845—Mr. Heywood’s motion in 1850—Prime Minister announces issue of Royal Commission—Opposition by Cambridge Residents—Action by New College and King’s College—The Oxford Commissioners—Their reception—Recommendations on University Teaching—Restoration of the Professorial system—Fellowships—University Government—Matriculation—The Cambridge Commissioners—University Government—Division of Tuition—General Council of Studies—Special Boards of Studies—New Professorships—College Contributions—Salaries of Professors—Appointment of Professors—Recommendations as to the Colleges—An Executive Commission—Cost of a University Course—Non-Collegiate System rejected—Affiliated Halls—Religious Tests—University Library—Concluding remarks—Difference between Oxford and Cambridge Reports—Far-reaching nature of Cambridge Report - - - 100-132

CHAPTER VII.

THE UNIVERSITY ACTS OF 1854 AND 1856.

Change of Government—Lord Palmerston's Letter—Appointment of Syndicate at Cambridge—Mr. Gladstone frames the Oxford Bill—The idea of an Executive Commission—Lord John Russell introduces the Bill—His Speech—Disappointment of the Nonconformists—The Second Reading—Proceedings in Committee—Amendments carried against the Government—The Bill in the House of Lords—Preamble of Act—Hebdomadal Council—Congregation—Mark Pattison on the Heathcote Amendment—Private Halls—Their failure—Colleges to frame new Statutes—And to contribute to the University—Partial Abolition of Tests—The Cambridge University Bill—Introduced by Mr. Bouverie—His Speech—Bill in Committee—House of Lords Stage—Royal Assent—The Executive Commission—Chief Clauses of the Act—Results of the two Acts—Mark Pattison's criticisms—Their comparative failure—Change in the character of the agitation	- - - - - 133-161
--	-------------------

CHAPTER VIII.

1856-1871.

Mark Pattison's "Suggestions"—Of Legislative Interference—A State-appointed Chancellor—The Hebdomadal Council—Congregation—Convocation—The Vice-Chancellor—A Financial Board—Centralised management of College property—Costliness of University education—Scholarships and Exhibitions—Unattached Students—The true economy—Fellowships—The general education position—What University Reform is—The organisation of Science—The reformed College—The German model—The revival of the Faculties—Law—Historical Studies—Amalgamation of Colleges—The Faculty of Arts—The Graduated Professoriate—The Pass Examinations—The Honours Examinations—The existing system of Oxford Education—Division between General and Special Studies—Training of Teachers—Length of Terms—The University course in detail—Pattison's scheme not practical but ideal—Goldwin Smith's "Reorganisation of Oxford University"—Rejects Pattison's ideal—The Fellowship system—Headships—Teaching by University and Colleges combined—Abolition of labour between them—Revival of the Faculties—Abolition of Pass Examinations—An Entrance Examination—Congregation—The Hebdomadal Council—The Vice-Chancellor—Delegacies—Control of education by the Universities—Visitors—The State and the Universities—Points of agreement between Pattison and Goldwin Smith	- - - - - 162-197
---	-------------------

CHAPTER IX.

THE LEGISLATION OF THE SEVENTIES.

First attempt to abolish Tests—Subsequent attempts—Effects of the Acts of 1854 and 1856—Lord Derby's Speech in 1854—The Bill of 1870—Lord E. Fitzmaurice's Speech—Bill of 1871—Proceedings in the Commons—In the Lords—Lord Salisbury's amendment—The Bill carried—Preamble of the Act—The Operative Clause—Royal Commission of 1872—Mr. Gladstone's Letter—The Commissioners—Cambridge Memorandum to Mr. Gladstone—The Conservatives take office—Mark Pattison's conjectural history of Lord Salisbury's Bill—Lord Salisbury's Speech on the Oxford University Bill in 1876—Dr. Tait's Speech—Proceedings in the Lords—University of Cambridge Bill in Commons—Both Bills withdrawn—The Joint Bill of 1877—Introduced in Commons—Amendments in Committee—Royal Assent—Preamble of the Act—The Executive Commissions—Clauses 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 44, 52, 53, 54—Effects of the Act—Mr. Arthur Gray's description—Abolition of Clerical Fellowships—The new Statutes—Terms—College Contributions—Common University Fund—The Financial Board—Special Boards of Studies—General Board of Studies - - - - - 198-232

CHAPTER X.

THE LATEST SUGGESTIONS FROM OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

Lord Curzon's "Principles and Methods of University Reform"—Introductory Chapter—Nine classes of suggestions—Constitution of the University—The Council—Congregation—Convocation—The Admission of poor men—Needs of the Working—Classes—The Non-Collegiate system—Hostels—Working men's Colleges—The Poor of other classes—Cost of living in Colleges—Fees and Dues—Scholarships and Exhibitions—A Redistribution scheme—Fellowships—University Examinations—The Pass Men—A Business education—Relations of the Colleges and the University—Educational relations—Growing strength of University—Colleges still dominate University—Boards of Faculties—Proposed reforms—Executive Machinery—Vice-Chancellor—University Staff—Encouragement of Research and of Advanced Study—Summary—The latest suggestions from Cambridge—Memorial of 1909 to the Council—Reconstitution of Electoral Roll—Functions of Senate and Electoral Roll—The Council's Report—Rejection of its recommendations - - - 233-263

CHAPTER XI.

THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

Report of 1852 here defective—Royal Commission Report, 1874—Origin of University and College endowments—Trusts—Lands

—House Property—Tithe and other Rent-charges—Stocks and Shares—Other properties—Income of the Universities and the Colleges—External—Internal—Their Expenditure—Cambridge University Chest, 1883 and 1913—Common University Fund—Gross Corporate Income of Colleges, 1883 and 1913—Fluctuations in Land, Houses and Tithe—Imperfect College returns—The corresponding Oxford statistics—The *Quarterly Review*—"A Plea for Cambridge"—Extension of Studies at Cambridge—Corporate Income of Colleges—Heavy Expenditure on Estates—The same at Oxford—Headships—Fellowships—Scholarships—Tuition Fund—Balance—University Income and Expenditure—Lord Curzon's Chapter VII—University Accounts partial—University Balance-sheet—Colleges Balance-sheet—The Published Accounts—College Contributions—College Financial Administration—Management of College Estates—Financial Policy of the University—Suggested Board of Finance—Statute establishing the same - 264-291

CHAPTER XII.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A SCHEME OF REFORM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

SECTION I.

Definition of University Reform—Its three branches—A Problem in Federalism—Mark Pattison's objection examined—Anticipated resistance of the Colleges—Encouragement from the progress of events—Opinion at Oxford—Examination of the Collegiate System—Numbers and resources of the Cambridge Colleges—Disparity in size and wealth—Competition for entries—Proportion of Honours to Matriculations—Proportion of Poll Degrees to Matriculations—Mr. Venn's figures—Number of First Classes, 1898-1907—Great differences between the Colleges—Influence of Athletics—Differences in tone and temper—Fluctuations in numbers—Difficulties of a small College—Multiplicity of Offices—Co-operation between the Colleges—The essence of the College System—Lies in its Tutorial and Domestic functions—Administrative work of the Colleges—Centralisation of administration—Bursars—The Colleges as land owners—Scattered College farms—College sentiment adverse—Lord Curzon's picture—The *Times* on Oxford College estates—The economic facts—House property—A Central Board needed—Stewards—A like suggestion—College standards of expenditure—Provision in the Act of 1877—Public Auditing of Accounts—Depreciation of investments—The Organisation of Teaching—The Poll men—The Honours men—Existing division of teaching between the University and the Colleges—A Lecture List analysed—Report of the Cambridge University Reform Committee on present system—Increasing co-operation between the Colleges—Additional powers for the General

Board of Studies and Special Boards of Studies—Reform of these bodies—Tutorial work of Colleges not to be touched—Grouping of the Colleges—Authorities for such a step—Clause 22 of the Act of 1877—How it might be given effect to—A Scheme of Grouping—The University point of view—Training of Teachers—A career at Oxford or Cambridge—The Fellowship system—Its cost—Its history—Effect of the Acts of 1855 and 1856—Prize Fellowships—Embody principle of emulation—Their disadvantages—Decrease in their number—Career Scholarships as a substitute—Fellowships as payment for College work—As Pensions—For Research—Examinations for Fellowships—The awarding of Fellowships—The title only to be retained—A career for Teaching—Position of Masters—Elasticity of the Federal principle—An appeal to the Colleges.

SECTION II.

University Organisation—The Chancellor—The Vice-Chancellor—The Council of the Senate—*Ex officio* members—The Electoral Roll—Proposals of the Reform Committee and the Council—Plan for keeping the Universities in touch with national life—Limitation in numbers—Power of initiative—Anomalous relations between University and Colleges—The Senate—Difficulties of the Reform Committee—Senate impossible as governing body—The Suspensory Veto—Solution of Women's Degrees difficulty.

SECTION III.

The Universities and National Education—Entries from 1850 to the present time—Slow rate of progress—Increase in subjects taught—In teachers—In buildings—Expense the obstacle—Statement of the Reform Committee—Criticism of it—Scholarships and Exhibitions—The actual awards—Helping poverty—Failure of Hostels and the Non-Collegiate System—How to reduce expenses—Scholarships a necessity—How and when to award them—Probable opposition by the Colleges—Necessity for a University Entrance Examination—Previous Examination becoming an Entrance Examination—Cambridge Memorial on the subject—Action at Oxford—Examinations—Examiners not trained—Dean Merivale's views—Board of Examinations required—Defects and contradictions of present Triposes—Unrestricted competition has been modified—Overloaded Examinations—The Classical Tripos—The Law Tripos—The multiplicity of Examinations—Principles of Examination Reform—Many University graduates still uneducated—Sir Clifford Allbutt's statement—Pass Examinations—A suggestion—Degrees—Advanced Studies—The Endowment of Research—Board of Advanced Study and Research required—The Library Question—Necessity for a Royal Commission—Intentions of Parliament must be carried out 292-380

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS 381-384

CORRECTIONS.

- p. 87 (note), *for* pp. 13-14 *read* pp. XIII-XIV.
- p. 89, line 16, *after* pamphlet *insert* entitled *Oxford Reform*.
- p. 94 (note), *for* *Historical Studies* *read* *Historical Sketches*.
- p. 145, line 32, *insert* quotation marks *after* canvas.
- p. 203, last line, *for* Ward *read* Wood.
- p. 228, line 30, *for* to, define *read* to define.
- p. 289, line 28, *for* Oxford University Gazette *read* *Oxford University Gazette*.
- p. 297 (note), *for* University Calendar *read* *University Calendar*.
- p. 345, line 26, *insert* comma *after* Vice-Chancellor.
- p. 362, line 29, *insert* comma *after* Classics.
- p. 363, line 23, *insert* comma *after* Non-Regent House.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

"The University of Cambridge," says the Report of the Royal Commission of 1850, "is a lay corporation, possessing various privileges under Charters of the Crown and Acts of Parliament or by prescription. The earliest Royal Letters Patent which can now be traced as authentic are of the reign of King Henry the Third.¹ These, however, do not found the University, but recognise it as already existing, with an organised constitution and regular form. Other Letters and Charters were granted from time to time by subsequent monarchs, of which the most ample and the most important is the Charter granted by Queen Elizabeth in the third year of her reign (dated April 26, 1561),² confirming former and conferring new privileges. In the thirteenth year of the same reign (June 7, 1571) an Act of Parliament was passed whereby it was enacted that 'the Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge' should be incorporated with perpetual succession under that title; and that the Letters Patent of the Queen, made in the third year of her reign, and also all other Letters Patent by any of Her Majesty's progenitors or predecessors, should be good in law to all intents."³

The Oxford Report of the Royal Commission of 1850 says of this same reign of Henry III., "At that time the University of Oxford was, we may almost say, the chief charity school of the poor, and the chief grammar-school

¹Cooper gives the following account of the earliest documents. "It seems that at this time (A.D. 1231), the ruling powers of the University experienced considerable inconvenience from the want of authority to punish offenders against academic discipline, from the claims of disorderly persons to the character of scholars in order more safely to pursue their malpractices, and from the exorbitant sums demanded by the townspeople for the rent of the hostels in which the scholars lived. In order to remedy these grievances the King issued four several writs, all tested at Oxford, the 3rd of May in this year."—*Annals of Cambridge*, Vol I., p. 41.

²The Charter is given in Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, Vol. II., pp. 165-168.

³*Ib.* Vol. II., pp. 274-276.

in England, as well as the great place of education for Students of Theology, of Law and of Medicine. The oldest of the great Public Schools was not yet founded. The Inns of Court and the Schools of Medicine had no existence, and many students from foreign Universities thought their education incomplete until they had visited the most-celebrated seat of English learning." Though the exact origin of Oxford and Cambridge is thus not precisely known, there is not the mystery about it which is generally imagined. "The constitution of the University of Paris formed the model on which that of Oxford and that of Cambridge were formed; the course of study, the collegiate system, even the regulations of the Sorbonne, were imitated with scrupulous fidelity."¹ Some time then during the 12th century arose these ancient institutions whose history we have begun to trace.

Oxford and Cambridge were thus Schools and Universities in one, open to all comers. "If we picture to ourselves some few hundred students, of all ages from early youth to complete manhood, mostly of very slender means, looking forward to the monastic or the clerical life as their future avocation, lodging among the town-folk, and receiving such accommodation as inexperienced poverty might be likely to obtain at the hands of practised extortioners, resorting to one large building, the grammar schools, or sometimes congregated in the porches of their respective Masters' houses, and there receiving such instruction in Latin as a reading from Terence, Boethius or Orosius, eked out by the more elementary rules from Priscian or Donatus, would represent—we shall probably have grasped the main features of a Cambridge course when Irnerius began to lecture at Bologna, Vacarius at Oxford, and when Peter Lombard compiled the Sentences"² (*i.e.* about 1150 A.D.).

Reference is made in this extract to the early age, it was fourteen or even under, at which undergraduates entered.³ There was the more necessity for this because

¹ Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, Vol. I., p. 67.

² *Ib.* Vol. I., p. 341.

³ "In the old matriculation books at Cambridge, many students have 'Imp.' *i.e.* *Impubes* written after their names, showing they were under

a long course lay before them. To begin with there were "arts" to be learned to the mystical number of seven. These were divided into two courses, the *Trivium* of three—Grammar (*i.e.* Latin), Logic and Rhetoric, and the *Quadrivium* of four—Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy and Music. To each Art a year's study was supposed to be given, so that the seven Arts took seven years to finish. To the Arts there were added later the three Faculties properly so-called of Theology, Law and Medicine. Theology took twelve years, Law and Medicine six each, so that the whole University course occupied from thirteen to nineteen years. Certificates of proficiency were awarded at four stages, and were called Degrees, or steps, *gradus*, because they marked the point at which a student had arrived. At the end of three years the student could become a Bachelor of Arts, *Baccalaureus Artium*, at the end of seven years a Master of Arts, *Magister Artium*, or to give the process in more detail, "the following were the successive stages which marked the progress of the Arts student: that of the Sophister, or disputant in the Schools,—of the Bachelor of Arts, eligible in turn to give subsidiary or cursory lectures,—of the incepting Master in Arts who has received his licence to teach in any University in Europe—and of the Regent Master of Arts who lectured for a definite term as an instructor appointed by the University."¹ "The possession of a Degree," the same writer also points out, "was originally nothing else than the possession of a diploma to exercise the function of teaching; a *right* which at a later period was equally recognised as a *duty*. The Bachelors expounded the Sentences (of Peter Lombard) and the Scriptures, the Doctors and Masters taught systematically in the Schools; but all those who had gained the degree of Licentiate, Master or Doctor were held *bound to devote a certain period to imparting again the learn-*

fourteen." Venn, *Oxford and Cambridge Matriculations*, p. 5. This practice of early entry continued to a surprisingly late date. Vicesimus Knox in his *Liberal Education* published in 1781 writes, "Boys should not be sent to the University so young as they often are. It is really cruel to let a boy of fifteen be precipitated into drunkenness and debauchery." *Works*, Vol. IV., p. 142.

¹ Mullinger, Vol. I., p. 358.

ing they had acquired."¹ The preliminary studies, the examinations, the licence to teach thus followed in a natural order. When a student had completed his Arts course, he was free to proceed to one of the Faculties, in which there were also two steps, Bachelor and Doctor.

In passing it may be remarked that Oxford from the first showed a preference for the *Trivium* and Cambridge for the *Quadrivium*, and that this distinction can be traced even to the present day. The language of instruction was Latin, the then universal tongue of science and learning, so that students coming from abroad were no strangers as far as their speech was concerned. Greek there was, broadly speaking, none. For that and for the classical education which has prevailed so long in our Public Schools and Universities, we are indirectly indebted to the Turks. As these barbaric invaders pressed more hardly upon the Eastern Empire centred at Constantinople, the Greek scholars retreated to the West carrying the literature of Greece with them. Classical learning penetrated these remote islands, took a hold of Oxford which it has never relinquished, and disputed with Mathematics the mastery of Cambridge.

The teaching in the early times was necessarily oral, as there were no printed books and manuscripts were rare and dear. It was either explanatory or dialectical, the latter method being the favourite. Every possible point was thrown into a *quaestio* and then discussed *pro.* and *con.* Examinations were oral also, and these again took the form of disputations or discussions, the defensive and offensive parts in them being called respectively "responsions" and "opponencies." The examiner held the balance even between the disputants and controlled the arguments so they did not wander into devious paths. Hence such terms as "Responsions" and "Moderations" at Oxford and "Moderator" (or Examiner) and "Wrangler" which still survive in the Mathematical Tripos at Cambridge. This system of teaching and examination had its drawbacks. "It was undoubtedly from the prevalence of this method of teaching that disputation became the besetting vice of

¹ *Ib.* Vol. I., p. 78.

the age. 'They dispute,' says Vives in his celebrated treatise, 'before dinner, at dinner and after dinner; in public and in private; at all places, and at all times.'"¹ So difficult is it to hit on the best methods either of imparting or testing knowledge.

At the beginning and for some centuries, the University gave its own instruction, in its own public schools, by means of its Masters of Arts and superior Graduates. The principle of the University doing its own teaching was extended and confirmed by the establishment of the Professoriate. The earliest foundation at Cambridge was that of the Lady Margaret Professorship of Divinity which dates from 1502. Lady Margaret, Countess of Richmond, was the mother of Henry VII., and to this munificent lady Cambridge owes not only its first Professorship but two of its Colleges, Christ's and St. John's. King Henry VIII. followed in 1540 with the five Regius Professorships, of Divinity, Civil Law, Physic, Hebrew and Greek. He endowed them with what was then an ample income—£40 a year, a sum which is still paid from the imperial Exchequer, less £7 2s. 8d. mysteriously intercepted on the way.

The University was originally a self-governing unity, an association of teachers united by mutual interest, divided into two Houses, that of the Regents, who were actually engaged in teaching, and of the Non-Regents, who had passed through the office of teacher. At the head was a Chancellor elected for two years by the Regents, who might on extraordinary occasions be continued in office for a third year. He summoned Convocations or Congregations of both the Houses to consult together for the common good and general interests of the University. No Graces, *i.e.* legislative proposals, could be proposed or passed without his assent. He was a King with a real power of veto. He was not allowed to be absent from the University for more than a month while the lectures or readings of the Masters of Arts were going on, though a Vice-Chancellor might be appointed by the Regents from year to year to relieve him of some portion of his duties. In later times the Graces before they were submitted to the general body or Senate were

¹ Mullinger, Vol. I., p. 361.

submitted to the discussion and approbation of a Council or *Caput Senatus*, which was usually appointed at the beginning of each Congregation.

The two Proctors were after the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor the most important administrative officers in the University. They were chosen annually on the 10th of October by the Regents. They regulated absolutely the times and modes of reading (*i.e.* teaching), disputations and inceptions in the public schools, and the public ceremonies of the University; they superintended the markets with a view to the supply of wine, bread, and other necessities to the undergraduates at reasonable rates; they had charge of the University finances; they could suspend a gremial, or resident, from his vote and a non-gremial from his degree; they collected the votes and announced the decisions of the House of Regents whose peculiar officers they were, they examined the candidates for degrees (Questionists) by themselves or their deputies; they superintended or controlled all public disputations and exercises, either by themselves or by their officers the Bedels; they administered the oaths of admission to all degrees, and they alone were competent to confer the important privileges of the Regency.¹

We can thus picture another scene. The Chancellor has decided upon a Grace. The bell sounds and the Senate or Convocation assembles, the Chancellor attended by his Bedels presiding. The *Caput* approves the Grace. The two Houses vote upon it, the Proctors taking the votes in the Regent House, the Scrutators (appointed for the purpose at each Congregation) taking them in the Non-Regent House. Both bodies approve and the Grace is forthwith added to the Statute law of the University. Non-residents had no part or lot in this arrangement. There was no post wherewith to acquaint them with the intended proceedings of the residents, nor railroads to bring them up to the scene of action.

The most momentous event in the history of Oxford and Cambridge was the foundation of the Colleges, yet none saw its significance, so quietly and naturally did it

¹ See Peacock, *Observations on the Statutes*, pp. 15, 24, quoted in Mullinger, Vol. I., pp. 140-144.

come about. The youthful students lodged with the townspeople, or in hostels kept for them by the graduates. Neither plan worked satisfactorily. The students complained of the exactions of the townspeople. The townspeople retorted disagreeably of the disorderly conduct of the students and of the non-payment of their just and lawful debts. Thus began the age-long quarrel between "town" and "gown." The hostels too, so it was alleged, were not always what they should have been, in that they were conducted for the benefit of the Heads rather than for that of the Students. Above all it was necessary to help the poor and struggling members of the University through their long and arduous course. Hence the idea occurred to two pious founders almost simultaneously, to Walter de Merton, at Oxford, in 1270, and to Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of Ely, at Cambridge, in 1284, to found a House for the reception of students. This was the origin of the Collegiate system and explains why the Masters of the Colleges are still called Heads of Houses. A forewarning of the attitude which the Colleges were destined afterwards to take up towards the University was given at the foundation of New College at Oxford and King's College at Cambridge, the one connected closely with Winchester, the other made up entirely of scholars from Eton. As for the latter, in addition to the various privileges granted, with the sanction of Parliament to it, the King obtained bulls from the Pope exempting the College and its members from the power and jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Ely, and the Chancellor of the University; and on the 31st of January, 1448-9, the University by an instrument under its Common Seal, granted that the College, its Provost, Fellows and Scholars, should be exempt from the power, dominion and jurisdiction of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Proctors, and Ministers of the University.¹

Men even when making a new departure like to found themselves on what is old, so it was natural that these pious founders should look round them for a model. What could serve their purpose so well as the monasteries, many of which had been conspicuous as homes of learning?

¹ Mullinger, Vol. I., p. 309.

The Colleges were not monasteries, they might even be anti-monastic in their intentions, but they were fashioned on monastic lines. The College buildings bear witness to this fact with their enclosed quadrangles, their chambers, their halls for common meals, and chapels for common worship. These same buildings are a difficulty in the way of the innovator when he wants to adapt them to modern requirements, and provide baths for the undergraduates and houses for the married members of the staff.

As for the inmates of the Colleges they dedicated themselves to learning as the monks dedicated themselves to religion. A College was made up of a Master, Fellows, and Scholars, who were accordingly said to be "on the foundation." The Scholars were made members of the foundation by a solemn ceremony, but they were excluded from the administration of the College property and business, and from the elections. They were the novices in the monastery of learning. The Fellows were first known in common with the Scholars as *Scholares*, because both were learners. At Christ Church they were called *Studentes*, and the terms Junior Student for Scholar and Senior Student for Fellow survive there till this day, but generally they were called *Socii*, members of the *societas* and sharers in its endowments. They were commonly ordered to be chosen from the founder's own kin or relatives, from certain schools or from certain counties or other definite areas, and the same restrictions were made in the case of the Scholars. The Fellows correspond to the monks—to the brethren in orders and the lay brethren. Over all was a Head, called variously Master, Warden, Provost, Rector, President or Principal. He may be likened to the Abbot. The Colleges soon began to teach, but they confined themselves in the first instance to exercises and discussions preparatory to those in the public schools, and their Praelectors or Lecturers discoursed to the University students generally, and not merely to the members of their own College.

Every College had its Statutes or rules. The objects of the Statutes were the maintenance of the Society under a regular government and with a regular rule of life and study. Each Scholar was placed under a Tutor who had to answer for his fines and expenses. The Tutor

as teacher is a later growth and explains the double use of the word, both as guardian and instructor. The Fellows took an oath of unqualified obedience to the Statutes, and in some cases an oath never to suffer any alteration in them.

As for the rule of study this was the old University course which has already been explained. The Fellow was generally required by the Statutes, after completing the Arts Course, to proceed in one of the Faculties, that of Theology in the majority of instances, while some would take up Law, and fewer still Medicine. The business of the Fellows was to study not to teach. After they had completed their education they took benefices, or practised Law or Medicine, and thus the ranks of the learned professions were filled.

The rule of life was simple. It included common meals, during which the Bible was read by the Bible Clerks, and silence kept, the use of the Latin tongue, uniformity in dress, strict obedience to the Head and College officers, terminal scrutinies for the purpose of inquiring into the life, morals, and progress in studies of all the members of the College, and a system of surveillance to be exercised by the Senior Fellows over the Junior. Regular attendance at the services of the Church was required of all, as was residence. A non-resident Fellow in those days was a contradiction in terms. Poverty was much insisted on as a qualification for a Fellowship. Hence the rule that no Fellow should possess more than a certain amount of property. Celibacy was an express obligation, and where Fellows had to be in Holy Orders it followed of necessity. The Heads were generally required to be in Priests' orders, and the great majority of the Fellows were required to take Priests' orders within a certain period after their election. Thus the three monastic obligations of poverty, chastity, and obedience were all well looked after. Every College had a Visitor whose functions were twofold: (1) to hear appeals and interpret the Statutes; and (2) to visit at certain intervals, either in person or by commission, for the purposes of inspection and, if need be, of reformation.

The College system once started speedily grew in riches and importance. New Colleges were constantly

being founded and received endowments from their founders, from benefactors, and from the Royal Bounty. The University has never been successful in stirring men's charity and it remains poor to this day amid the ever-increasing resources of the Colleges, and where the wealth is, there will the influence be also. "The instruction passed into the hands of the Colleges, partly, perhaps, in consequence of the decline of the Scholastic Philosophy, which formed the staple of the old Academical system, and the rise of the Classical studies which the Colleges took up. Ultimately no one was allowed to be a member of the University without being a member of a College."¹

This process of the University decreasing and the Colleges increasing was helped on by the course of events. It fell to the lot of Elizabeth after the Reformation, to settle the form of the State-Church and its relations with the State. In this settlement two such bodies as the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, so strong, so rich, and so intimately connected with the Church, could not be left out of account.

The first paragraph of this chapter refers to an Act of Parliament of the thirteenth year of Queen Elizabeth, confirming all the rights and privileges of the University of Cambridge. But there is another side to this picture of royal graciousness. The Puritans at this time were strong and active at Cambridge. At first they confined their opposition to "wearing the cap and surplice, and such like apparel, and the posture in receiving the sacrament," but afterwards they went much further. Their leader was Thomas Cartwright, a Fellow of Trinity College and Lady Margaret Reader in Divinity. He openly attacked the Church of England form of government as unscriptural, and taught that "archbishops, deans, archdeacons, etc., were offices and names of impiety." Such conduct was not to be tolerated and the Church of England party in the University at once took proceedings against him. It was pending these proceedings that Whitgift, Master of Trinity College, informed Sir William Cecil, Chancellor of the University, that it was in his

¹ Goldwin Smith, *Reorganisation of the University of Oxford*, p. 6.

opinion necessary that the Statutes of the University should be reviewed and amended. Sir William Cecil approved of the suggestion, and referred the consideration of the business to Whitgift and the other Masters of Colleges, who prepared the draft of the new Code. This was submitted to the Chancellor who, after consulting Archbishop Parker thereon, approved of the same, and it received the Royal Assent on September 25, 1570.

Queen Elizabeth and her advisers had come to the conclusion that the University as a single and unified body was more dangerous than the several Colleges in their individual capacity were likely to be. They therefore decided to favour the component parts at the expense of the corporate whole. Elizabeth's second Code effected what was practically a revolution. How this was brought about deserves to be carefully studied. "The University, in its earlier stages, was regulated, as to its internal administration, by Statutes or Ordinances framed and passed by its own legislative Senate"¹; but by the Elizabethan Statutes "the Heads of Houses were constituted a distinct and separate estate in the government of the University. In the election of the Vice-Chancellor, the ordinary Lecturers, the Bedels, and inferior officers, they were empowered to nominate two persons, one of whom was necessarily chosen by the united Houses of Regents and Non-Regents on the following day; a most important privilege, which they further amplified by interpretation. For the office of Vice-Chancellor two Heads of Houses were always nominated, so that the office still goes in rotation to the Masters of the Colleges. They were united with the Doctors and Scrutators in choosing the *Caput Senatus*. The Chancellor could not expel a student or Scholar, nor imprison a Doctor or Head of a House without the concurrence of a majority of their number; they were the councillors and assessors of the Chancellor in matters affecting the conduct and discipline of the scholars; they fixed the times and the subjects of the ordinary and other lectures; they were discharged from the performance of all exercises in the public schools and elsewhere; and an absolute veto was

¹ Royal Commission (Cambridge) Report, 1852, p. 2.

given to them in their own Colleges, in all elections of Fellows, Scholars, officers and servants, and in the granting of leases and all public acts whatsoever. Finally they were made the authorised interpreters of whatever was doubtful or ambiguous in the new Code.

“The *Caput Senatus*, composed of the Chancellor, a Doctor of each of the three faculties, a Non-Regent and a Regent Master of Arts, was appointed at the beginning of the academical year. To each of these sextumviri was given an absolute *вето*, and no Grace, whether for Degrees or for any object whatever could be submitted to the Houses of Regents and Non-Regents which had not received the previous sanction of every member of the *Caput*.

“The extraordinary powers conferred upon this body by their continuance during an entire year, and the exclusion of the great body of the Senate from all share in its nomination, were innovations upon the ancient constitution of the University of the most important and fundamental character. By the Statutes which were previously in force, some at least of the members of the *Caput* were generally appointed for one Congregation only; and whatever were the powers which they possessed in one Congregation, they could not permanently retard or embarrass the legislative or administrative proceedings of the University. The ancient powers of the Proctors, whether in the Congregation or elsewhere, were either entirely abrogated or greatly circumscribed; they were formerly elected openly by the Regents, but were now nominated according to a cycle of Colleges, and merely submitted to the Regents for their approbation. Whatever authority was given to them, by the ancient statutes, of regulating the times and subjects of the public readings and disputations, of imprisoning scholars, of suspending gremials from their votes in the Congregations or from Degrees taken or to be taken, and even in extreme cases of acting in defiance of the Chancellor himself, were now either abrogated or transferred to the Chancellor and his assessors. The custody of the public and of the private chests, and the administration of the finances of the University, were given to the Chancellor and the proper *custodes*; they no longer continued to be the chief

administrative officers of the University as the organs of the House of Regents, but were made, in all their functions, that of creation excepted, subordinate to the authority of the Chancellor. They were still required to regulate the disputations of the Masters of Arts, and to control the public exercises in all the Schools (those of Theology excepted); while the power of inflicting punishments and imposing fines was given to the Chancellor. . . .

"The University continued to retain the power of making new statutes 'for the increase of learning, and the preservation of discipline and good conduct amongst scholars,' provided they neither detracted from, nor interfered with, the Royal Statutes; all other statutes and customs which were contrary to them were declared to be abrogated and rescinded."¹

A similar policy was pursued by Elizabeth at Oxford. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, who was Chancellor of the University from 1565 to 1588, carried through the necessary changes in the Statutes. Under James the First both the Universities were more effectively closed against all who were not members of the Church of England, as that monarch sent letters which enjoined subscription to the three articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon upon admission to Degrees, which had not previously been required. It was Laud who, in the reign of Charles I., by his Code, known as the Laudian or Caroline Statutes (which were practically a confirmation of those of Elizabeth), put the final impress of character on Oxford. He attempted the visitation of Cambridge, but the Puritans rose in arms against him and he was compelled to retire. At Oxford he worked his will to the full. Professor Goldwin Smith thus describes what happened.²

"The constitution of the University was subverted in three ways. (1) Laud, confirming an arrangement made under Leicester, took away the initiative in legislation from the Convocation and vested in the Board of Heads of Houses (entitled the Hebdomadal

¹ Peacock, *Observations on the Statutes*, pp. 45-51. (Quoted in Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. II., pp. 258-261.)

² *Reorganisation*, p. 7.

Board), men elected by close Colleges, themselves without educational duties, and by their social position estranged from such educational activity as there might be in the place. (2) The Vice-Chancellorship, which, the Chancellor being now a non-resident grandee, was really the chief office of the University, was made rotatory among the Heads of Houses, and the University was thus deprived of the power of electing its own head. (3) Through the system of dispensations and the disregard of the College Statutes respecting residence, Convocation became to a much greater extent non-resident, while the facilities of communication and locomotion having increased, non-resident members began to come up more frequently to vote; and thus the University fell under the control of a non-resident and non-academical body, mainly clerical, and using its power for the objects of the political and ecclesiastical party to which the clergy belonged. Railroads have greatly intensified the last-mentioned evil.

“The constitutions of the separate Colleges also tacitly underwent a momentous change. The Head was originally a celibate, living with the Fellows. In the case of the Colleges founded before the Reformation it was not necessary to bind him expressly to celibacy, because he was always a priest, and a priest could not be married; in the Colleges founded after the Reformation he was expressly bound. The Heads, however, of the earlier Colleges took advantage of the legal flaw, those of the later got the restriction repealed; the original lodgings in the tower were exchanged for a separate and domestic house, and thus the Head of each College became socially severed from his Fellows, and the whole order from the University at large, almost absolute power over which it at the same time acquired.

“The result of these untoward accidents, combined with the general deadness of public duty during the greater part of the last century, was not only torpor but corruption within the University itself, and fatal estrangement from the nation. The effect upon the character of our governing class, bred up here in ignorance and Jacobitism, was calamitous at the time, and has not yet been effaced.”

The same writer could accordingly describe Oxford in his historical statement to the Commissioners of 1850 in these terms :—

“The Colleges have now become the University, and have absorbed all the functions of that institution, both educational and literary. Its Students must all be members of one of these Societies. Their Heads furnish its Vice-Chancellors, and form its Board of Executive Governors; their Fellows are its Teachers, its Examiners, its Proctors, its learned men, and its ordinary Legislature. The only elements of the University external to the Colleges are the staff of Professors and the five surviving Halls. . .

“The function of teaching has been super-added to the statutable duties of a Tutor; and Tutorships, limited in number, have been established in all the Colleges. The Tutors are nominated solely by the Head, and are almost invariably chosen from the number of the Fellows.

“The rule of study imposed by the Statutes, as regards the Graduate Fellows, has, with the change of the University system, become wholly obsolete.

“The rule of life, as regards the Graduate Fellows, has also ceased to be observed. Its only remnant consists in the use, which is no longer obligatory, of a common Hall, and the retention of a few old customs.

“Residence in the case of actual Fellows not holding College offices, is in all cases entirely dispensed with. . . All the statutable duties of a Fellowship having thus become obsolete, the Fellowships are sinecures, with the exception perhaps of those which are held by Tutors, and which may be considered as forming part of their otherwise inadequate stipend. A certain number may be likewise regarded as forming prizes for academical merit bestowed by examination. . .

“The Visitors continue to receive appeals which they try privately. They have long ceased to visit their Colleges, or to interfere spontaneously for the enforcement of Statutes, the correction of abuses or any other purpose.

“The oaths to observe the Statutes are sworn as before.”¹

Professor Goldwin Smith elsewhere explains that the

¹ Statement, pp. 6-8.

University as the Federal bond of the Colleges retained the holding of the examinations, the granting of degrees, and the exercise of discipline outside the College precincts.

If any further proof were needed of the low estate to which the Universities had sunk it might be found in the fact that New College at Oxford and King's College at Cambridge had demanded and obtained degrees for their undergraduate members without any University examination.

The Elizabethan Codes maintained their existence from 1570 till they were swept away by the Acts of 1854 and 1856—a period not far short of 300 years. They were consequently still the nominal law of the Universities in the year 1800, but time had made them obsolete in many respects and impossible of fulfilment.

Oxford and Cambridge have undergone great vicissitudes of fortune, as they have been affected by pestilence, civil war, and revolution either in Church or State. The number of their students in pre-Reformation times has no doubt been greatly exaggerated, but it must have been very large in proportion to the population. The Reformation was a temporary disaster. The dissolution of the monasteries and the suppression of the religious orders caused a complete cessation of the flow of monks and friars. As the University of Oxford put it, addressing Sir Thomas More, “Abbots are ordering their monks home, nobles taking away their sons, and priests their nephews and kinsmen. The number of scholars is decreasing, our halls are going to decay, and all liberal studies waxing cold. The Fellows of Colleges are almost the only residents left.”¹ But as the clergy went out, the laity gradually came in, and “in the first quarter of the seventeenth century both Universities were as large as they were destined to be for over two hundred years, until 1850, in fact.”² The Restoration brought peace, but it can hardly be said to have brought prosperity. A period of lethargy set in during which Oxford fell to almost incredible depths. The old examination system had become obsolete, and nothing had been put in its place. A Continental observer, Wendeborn, who travelled through

¹ Wood, quoted by Mark Pattison, *Suggestions*, p. 130.

² Venn, *Matriculations*, p. 3.

England before 1788, gives an amusing account of what he saw. The Presiding Examiner, the Respondent, or candidate for a Degree, and the three Opponents came into the Schools and amid profound silence passed the statutory time in the study of a novel or other entertaining work.¹ Oxford in fact gave its Degrees without any examination to all who had paid their fees and kept the required number of terms. Cambridge was saved from falling quite so low by the influence of Sir Isaac Newton and his successors. It required a certain amount of mathematics before granting a Degree.

In 1800 there was at Cambridge the same number of Colleges, 17, as there is now, the youngest of them, Downing, having been incorporated into the University on September 22nd of the same year. The list of Colleges in order of foundation is St. Peter's or Peterhouse (A.D. 1284), Clare (1326), Pembroke (1347), Gonville and Caius (1348), Trinity Hall (1350), Corpus (1352), King's (1441), Queens' (1448), St. Catharine's (1473), Jesus (1496), Christ's (1505), St. John's (1511), Magdalene (1519), Trinity (1546). These 14 may be accounted pre-Reformation Colleges. The remaining are Emmanuel (1584), Sidney Sussex (1596), and Downing (1800). There was but one examination for a Degree, the Mathematical Tripos, the first list of which is for the year 1747-8. Classics had been encouraged by the institution of the Chancellor's Medals, first given by the Duke of Newcastle in 1751. Until 1871 inclusive, candidates for these medals were required to have passed the Mathematical Tripos and to have gained a place among the Senior Optimes at least. There were also in 1800 twenty-one Professors—three of Divinity, the four Regius Professors of Civil Law, Physic, Hebrew and Greek, two of Mathematics, two of Astronomy, two of Arabic, four of the Natural Sciences, Chemistry, Anatomy, Botany and Geology, and also the Professors of Moral Philosophy, Music, Modern History and the Laws of England.

At Oxford in 1800 there were 20 Colleges—Merton (founded A.D. 1270), University (1280), Exeter (1314), Oriel (1326), Balliol (1340), Queen's (1340), New (1386), Lincoln

¹ Quoted in Hamilton, *Discussions*, p. 759 (note).

(1417), All Souls (1438), Magdalen (1457), Brasenose (1509), Corpus Christi (1516), Christ Church (1525). These may be counted as the pre - Reformation Colleges. There followed Trinity (1555), St. John's (1555), Jesus (1571), Wadham (1612), Pembroke (1624), Worcester (1714), and Hertford (1740). The last - mentioned College subsequently became extinct, but by an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1874 Magdalen Hall was re-endowed under this name as a close Church of England foundation. Keble College, another close Church of England foundation, was admitted into the University in 1871. It enjoys all the privileges of a College except as regards the status of its Head, who is not eligible for the office of Vice-Chancellor. It is also the only College at Oxford which has no Fellows, while All Souls has Fellows but no undergraduates.

The Professoriate has had much the same history at Oxford as at Cambridge. There also the Lady Margaret founded the first Professorship, that of Divinity, in 1496. Henry VIII. followed in 1535 with five Regius Professorships as at the sister University. Besides the above there were in 1800 thirteen other Professorships, one Praelectorship, and one Readership, the subjects being Astronomy (2), Moral Philosophy, History (2), Music, Arabic (2), Poetry, Botany, Anglo-Saxon, Law, Medicine, Natural Philosophy and Anatomy. Instruction was thus provided as pleased benevolent founders, and not as the University discovered its own needs.

CHAPTER II.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CRITICISM.

Cardinal Newman in the Discourse introductory to his book entitled "The Idea of a University"¹ has the following passage:—"About fifty years since, the English University of which I was so long a member, after a century of inactivity, at length was roused, at a time when (as I may say) it was giving no education at all to the youth committed to its keeping, to a sense of the responsibilities which its profession and its station involved. . . . The course of beneficial change made progress, and what was at the first but the result of individual energy and an act of the academical corporation, gradually became popular, and was taken up and carried out by the separate collegiate bodies of which the University is composed. This was the first stage of the controversy. Years passed away, and then political adversaries arose against it, and the system of education which it had established was a second time assailed. . . . In the former of these two controversies the charge brought against its studies was their remoteness from the occupations and duties of life, to which they are the formal introduction, or, in other words, their *inutility*; in the latter, it was their connexion with a particular form of belief, or, in other words, their *religious exclusiveness*."

The writer recurs to the subject in the seventh Discourse of the same book—that on Knowledge and Professional Skill. "This question (the respective merits of a 'liberal' and a 'useful' education) formed one main subject of the controversy, to which I referred in the

¹ This book consists of a series of nine lectures addressed to the Catholics of Dublin. It was first published in 1852 under the title of "The Scope and Nature of University Education" and was republished later on under the altered title.

Introduction to the present Discourses, as having been sustained in the first decade of this century by a celebrated Northern Review on the one hand, and defenders of the University of Oxford on the other. Hardly had the authorities of that ancient seat of learning, waking from their long neglect, set on foot a plan for the education of the youth committed to them, than the representatives of science and literature in the city which has sometimes been called the Northern Athens, remonstrated, with their gravest arguments and their most brilliant satire, against the direction and shape which the reform was taking. . . . It was not to be expected that they would be allowed to walk at leisure over the field of controversy which they had selected. Accordingly they were encountered in behalf of the University by two men of great name and influence in their day; . . . and the defence thus provided for the Oxford studies has kept its ground to this day. . . . These defenders, I have said, were two, of whom the more distinguished was the late Dr. Copleston, then a Fellow of his College (Oriental), successively its Provost, and Protestant Bishop of Llandaff. . . . His peculiar vigour and keenness of mind enabled him, when a young man, single-handed with easy gallantry, to encounter and overthrow the charge of three giants of the North combined against him. I believe I am right in saying that, in the progress of the controversy, the most scientific, the most critical, and the most witty, of that literary company, all of them now, as he himself, removed from this visible scene, Professor Playfair, Lord Jeffrey, and the Rev. Sydney Smith, threw together their several efforts into one article of their Review, in order to crush and pound to dust the audacious controvertist who had come out against them in defence of his own Institutions."

These sentences from Newman may serve as a starting - point for this history. It was in 1800 that Oxford, "waking from its long neglect," passed its new Statute instituting examinations for a Degree. Cambridge had long anticipated it by establishing the Mathematical Tripos in 1747-8 though it delayed the Classical Tripos till 1824. The "hardly" of Cardinal

Newman covers a period of ten years.¹ Copleston published in 1810 his Reply to the "Calumnies of the *Edinburgh Review* against Oxford," in which he complains of "covert insinuation, and open railing, sarcastic sneers and allusions" and then of "bold accusations against the English Universities and especially against Oxford" (p. 10). Let us deal with each of these charges in turn.

An example of the first may be found in some extracts from Don Manuel Espriella's "Letters from England."² Espriella was an imaginary Spaniard who was supposed to have come to England in 1802.

"In another part of the book, while on a visit to Cambridge he (Espriella) makes some observations, from which we may gather his opinion of both Universities. I inquired of one whom I met what were the real advantages of these institutions to the country at large, and to the individuals who study in them. 'They are of this service,' he replied, 'to the country at large, that they are the great schools by which established opinions are inculcated and perpetuated. I do not know that men gain much here, yet it is a regular and essential part of our education; and they who have not gone through it always feel that their education has been defective. A knowledge of the world, that is to say, of our world, and of the men in it is gained here; and that knowledge remains when Greek and Geometry are forgotten.' I asked him which was the best of the two Universities; he answered that Cambridge was as much superior to Oxford, as Oxford was to Salamanca. I could not forbear smiling at his scale of depreciation; he perceived it, and begged my pardon, saying, that he as little intended to undervalue the establishments of my country, as to overrate the one of which he was himself a member. 'We are bad enough,' said he, 'Heaven knows; but not so bad as Oxford. They are now attempting to imitate us in some of those points wherein

¹ "The first Statute for the awarding of Honours by Public Examination was passed in 1800. In 1807, this Statute was abrogated on the ground that it needed improvement in several points." *Oxford Reform and Oxford Professors*, by H. H. Vaughan, p. 6. It may be this second Statute which Newman had in his mind.

² *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. XI., pp. 378-379. Jan. 1808.

the advantage on our part is too notorious to be disputed. The effect may be seen in another generation—meantime, the imitation is a confession of inferiority.’ ”

The Reviewer continues:—

“To the question whether we might regard the Universities as the seats of learning and the Muses, we have the following particularly smart answer: ‘As for the Muses, Sir, you have traversed the banks of the Cam, and must know whether you have seen any *nine ladies* who may answer their description. We do certainly produce verses, both Greek and Latin, which are worthy of gold medals, and English ones also, after the newest and most approved receipt for verse-making. Of learning, such as is required for the purposes of tuition, there is much; beyond it, except in Mathematics, none. In this we only share the common degeneracy. The Moham-medans believe that when Gog and Magog are to come, the race of men will have dwindled to such littleness, that a shoe of one of the present generation will serve them for a house. If this prophecy be typical of the intellectual diminution of the species, Gog and Magog may soon be expected in the neighbourhood of their own hills.’¹

“‘The truth is, Sir,’ he continued, ‘that the institutions of men grow old like men themselves, and, like women, are always the last to perceive their own decay. When Universities were the only schools of learning, they were of great and important utility; as soon as there were others, they ceased to be the best, because their forms were prescribed, and they could adopt no improvement till long after it was generally acknowledged. There are other causes of decline. We educate for only one profession; when colleges were founded, that one was the most important; it is now no longer so; they who are destined for the others find it necessary to study elsewhere, and it begins to be perceived that this is not a necessary stage upon the road. This might be remedied. We have professors of everything, who hold their situations and do nothing. In Edinburgh, the income of the professor depends upon his exertions; and, in conse-

¹ The Gogmagog Hills are just outside Cambridge to the S.E.

quence, the reputation of that University is so high that Englishmen think it necessary to finish their education by passing a year there. They learn shallow metaphysics there, and come back worse than they went, inasmuch as it is better to be empty than flatulent.'"

To turn to the next count in Copleston's indictment—the first of the "bold accusations" appears to occur in a review of La Place's "*Traité de Mécanique Celeste*." The writer says:—¹

"In the list of the mathematicians and philosophers, to whom physical astronomy, for the last sixty or seventy years has been indebted for its improvements, hardly a name from Great Britain falls to be mentioned. What is the reason of this?" His answer to his own question is as follows:—²

"We believe that it is chiefly in the public institutions of England that we are to seek for the causes of the deficiency here referred to, and particularly in the two great centres from which knowledge is supposed to radiate over all the rest of the island. In one of these, where the dictates of Aristotle are still listened to as infallible decrees, and where the infancy of science is mistaken for its maturity, the mathematical sciences have never flourished; and the scholar has no means of advancing beyond the mere elements of geometry."

The Reviewer, having thus demolished Oxford in a single sentence, next turns his attention to Cambridge and criticises it at greater length. He admits that "in the other seminary, the dominion of prejudice is not equally strong; . . . mathematical learning is there the great object of study, but still we must object to the method in which this object is pursued. . . . The pupil must study, not to learn the spirit of geometry, or to acquire the *δυναμὶς εὐρητική* by which the theorems were discovered, but to know them as a child knows his chatechism, by heart, so as to answer readily to certain interrogations."³

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. XI., p. 279.

² p. 283.

³ Sir William Hamilton (*Discussions*, p. 320) maintains that this article, written by Playfair, was the means of forcing on Cambridge the knowledge of the Continental analysis. According to Hamilton, Cambridge then went to the other extreme and became conspicuous for the undue predominance of algebraic mathematics.

The *Edinburgh Review*, which dealt so scornfully with Oxford mathematics, did not even spare its classics. In an article on the Clarendon Press edition of Strabo¹ the Reviewer thus opens the attack:—

“Nothing in Europe is at all comparable, in point of extent and magnificence, to the endowment of the University of Oxford,—or to the veneration which is there paid to the Greek and Latin languages.” He admits that it is “not without reason, that this learned University makes the study of the Greek and Latin languages, especially of the former, its first object in the education of those committed to its care.” He admires “the spacious and comfortable abodes, and ample revenues provided for the instructors, which exempt them from all worldly cares, but those of learning and teaching.” The Clarendon Press at Oxford, too, being richly endowed, always “raises the highest expectations in the mind of every scholar,” but somehow “the constant renovation of hope has hitherto been followed by as constant a succession of disappointments.” The edition of Apollonius Rhodius was an “unhappy attempt”; the “single and minute, but very successful instance of Aristotle’s *Poetics* was produced by an *auxiliary volunteer*.” “Of the Homer, the editors appear to be at least half a century behind the rest of the world in critical knowledge.” The edition of Strabo is then reviewed in detail and with great severity.

The third article which raised the ire of Oxford was a review² of Edgeworth’s *Essays on Professional Education*. The writer while denying that Mr. Edgeworth is “either very new, very profound, or very right in his opinions,” yet returns him “thanks for the courage with which he has combated the excessive abuse of classical learning in England,” and quotes with approval a passage beginning thus:—“The principal defect in the present system of our great schools is, that they devote too large a portion of time to Latin and Greek. It is true, that the attainment of classical literature is highly desirable; but it should not, or rather it need not, be the exclusive object of boys during eight or nine years.”

Mr. Edgeworth having attacked classics in the public schools, the Reviewer on his part extends the assault to

¹ Vol. XIV., p. 429.

² Vol. XV., pp. 40-53.

the Universities themselves. "A young Englishman," he says, "goes to school at six or seven years old, and he remains in a course of education till twenty-three or twenty-four years of age. In all that time, his sole and exclusive occupation is learning Latin and Greek¹; he has scarcely a notion that there is any other kind of excellence; and the great system of facts with which he is most perfectly acquainted, are the intrigues of the Heathen Gods; with whom Pan slept? with whom Jupiter?—whom Apollo ravished? These facts the English youth get by heart the moment they quit the nursery; and are most sedulously and industriously instructed in them till the best and most active part of life is passed away." And again²: "All the solid and masculine parts of (a young man's) understanding are left wholly without cultivation; he hates the pain of thinking, and suspects every man whose boldness and originality call upon him to defend his opinions and prove his assertions, and worst of all a genuine Oxford tutor would shudder to hear his young men disputing upon moral and political truth, forming and pulling down theories, and indulging in all the boldness of youthful discussion. He would augur nothing from it, but impiety to God, and treason to kings."³ As a practical suggestion the Reviewer recommends Political Economy. "When an University has been doing useless things for a long time, it appears at first degrading to them to be useful. A set of lectures upon political economy would be discouraged at Oxford, probably despised, probably not permitted; . . . but what ought the term University to mean, but a place where every science is taught which is liberal and is useful to mankind? Nothing will so much tend to bring classical literature within proper bounds, as a steady and invariable appeal to utility in our appreciation of all human knowledge."⁴

It was not to be supposed that Oxford would allow accusations and assertions such as these to go unnoticed, and in 1810 Copleston published his pamphlet

¹ He adds in a footnote:—"Unless he goes to the University of Cambridge, and then classics occupy him entirely about ten years; and divide him with mathematics for four or five more."

² p. 49.

³ p. 50.

⁴ p. 51.

“A Reply to the calumnies of the *Edinburgh Review* against Oxford containing an account of studies pursued in that University.” After a general introduction he deals in his first chapter with the charge from the article on La Place; in the second chapter, with the review of Strabo; in the third, with the review of Edgeworth; in the fourth he explains the course of studies pursued at Oxford; while in the fifth and concluding chapter he discourses on plans of education in general and particularly of English education. The final pages of Copleston’s pamphlet betray his sense that all was not well at Oxford in spite of his valiant defence. He writes: “There are some points in the constitution of this place . . . which ought to be known and well-considered before any comparison is made between what we are, and what we ought to be. *The University of Oxford is not a national foundation.* It is a congeries of foundations, originating some in royal munificence, but more in private piety and bounty. They are moulded indeed into one corporation; but each one of our twenty Colleges is a corporation by itself, and has its own peculiar Statutes, not only regulating its internal affairs, but confining its benefits by a great variety of limitations; . . . now it is certain that each of these constitutions cannot be the best.”¹ As for reform, he pleads the sacredness of private property and the sanctity of wills, and specifically rejects the proposal of Mr. Cockburn, late Christian Advocate at Cambridge, to limit the duration of all Fellowships to ten or twelve years.

The reply of the *Edinburgh Review* to Copleston, of which Cardinal Newman gives so lively an account, is to be found in Vol. XVI., pp. 158-187. It goes over the whole ground again and concludes with this challenge, which it is safe to say, was never replied to; the facts would have been too damning. “For his University lectures, if (the author of the pamphlet) really wishes to be honest, let him give to the public, 1st, a list of lecturers who receive salaries and do nothing for them; 2nd, a list of lecturers who do read; 3rdly, the average number of their pupils for three years past; 4thly, the number of

¹ p. 133.

lectures read in the year; 5thly, the whole number of undergraduates and bachelors in the University."

Copleston published in the same year, 1810, "A Second Reply to the *Edinburgh Review*, by the Author of a Reply to the Calumnies of that Review against Oxford," and in 1811 a "Third Reply," but this last was drawn by a remark in a review of Woodhouse's *Trigonometry*¹ and deals with quite a minor point. The trio of *Edinburgh Reviewers* contented themselves with their one combined article, and thus the wordy warfare finally flickered out.

Mr. T. E. Kebbel in his life of Copleston in the *Dictionary of National Biography*² agrees with Newman as to the issue of the contest. He says: "The *Edinburgh Review* soon afterwards published an attack on the Oxford system of education, to which Copleston at once replied and completely demolished his antagonist, whom he convicted not only of stark ignorance of what he had undertaken to condemn, but of much bad Latin besides." This is surely an inadequate account of the matter. It was more than a question of bad Latin or bad Greek either. Of the two words of Greek quoted above one is wrong, and Copleston triumphantly fastens on the long *e* which ought to be short, though he does not notice the queer spelling "chatechism" which comes immediately after it and is an equally worthy object of attack. As for the bad Latin there was some on both sides, and the best that Copleston could say for the Oxford Latinity was that it was no worse than the average modern commodity. With regard to the conviction of stark ignorance, the sentence which gave most offence was that in which Oxford was described as a place "where the dictates of Aristotle are still listened to as infallible decrees, and where the infancy of science is mistaken for its maturity, the mathematical sciences have never flourished, and the scholar has no means of advancing beyond the mere elements of geometry." These charges were not all literally true. Copleston had no difficulty in showing that the critical faculty at Oxford was occasionally brought to bear even on Aristotle, that it had some scientific ideas

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. XVII., p. 126.

² Vol. XII., p. 175.

that were more than elementary, and that a scholar had the means of advancing beyond the mere elements of geometry. But because a man overstates his case, is he thereby proved to have no case at all? One of the above assertions was literally true. The mathematical sciences did not then flourish at Oxford. They do not flourish there now. In 1810, Oxford almost wholly neglected science, and was far too much in bondage to the authority of Aristotle. On this latter point let Sir William Hamilton be called as a witness. He writes, "The easier parts of Aristotle's system were indeed still retained; but these might, in the circumstances, have been as well omitted; because read as fragments, and by minds undisciplined to abstraction, they could neither be understood themselves, nor stimulate the intellect to understand aught else. There was no gradation from the easy to the difficult, from the new to the old. Philosophy was taught, philosophy was learned more by rote than by reason; and an abrupt intrusion by the tyro thinker into the Ethics or Politics of the Stagirite might discourage or disgust even a potential Montesquieu. Logic alone was studied in a modern summary. But here too the unphilosophical character of the Oxford philosophical discipline is apparent. That University, having formerly adopted, still adheres to the *Compendium* of Aldrich, not because Aldrich was a learned dialectician, but an academical dignitary; and the book, not overvalued by its able author, after leading and misleading Oxford logicians, during former generations, at last affords a more appropriate text for their corrections in the present. But should Alma Mater thus lag behind her alumni?"¹ He adds in a note, "See Mr. Mansel's Notes on the Rudimenta of Aldrich. Of these, without disparagement to the Dean, it may be said—'La sauce vaut mieux que le poisson.'"

Copleston really gave his case away when he affirmed that the University was not a national institution. He felt that there was nothing in existence at Oxford which deserved to be called by that name, and laid the blame on the twenty Colleges, some of which he admitted had imperfect constitutions. The Edinburgh Reviewers

¹ *Discussions*, p. 809.

regarded the University as a national institution. They criticised it from that point of view, and they found it wanting. It undoubtedly was wanting, so that if the formal victory is given to Copleston, the real victory must be assigned to the critics. The Reviewers made little or no suggestion of reform. They attacked things as they stood. Their words made but slight impression at the time, but they showed that the spirit of criticism was alive, and inspired the hope that the effects of it might be seen in days to come.

The reader may get further light by reading the following accounts of the Examination system as it prevailed at Oxford and Cambridge in these early days.

The first is by Copleston himself, and is to be found in the "Reply to the Calumnies," pp. 138-147, and runs thus:

"According to the last regulations, the University honours are obtained in the following manner.

"As soon as the student enters on his third year, he is subject to a public examination, which admits him, not to the Degree of Bachelor of Arts, but to that intermediate step, which still retains its old title of *Sophista Generalis*. The old exercise was a logical disputation in the public Schools on three philosophical questions, which had long dwindled into an insignificant form, before the present exercise was substituted in its room. At this previous examination he is expected to construe accurately some one Greek and one Latin book at least; the most difficult works are not required or encouraged, as there is no competition between the candidates, and an accurate grammatical acquaintance with the structure of the two languages is the point chiefly inquired into. Xenophon, Homer, Herodotus, Sophocles, Euripides and Demosthenes among the Greeks, and Virgil, Horace, Sallust, Livy and Cicero among the Latins, are the most usual books. Besides this, he is examined in some compendium of Logic (generally Aldrich's), which is never omitted, and in the elements of Geometry and Algebra. All this is done in public. Eight candidates may be examined in one day, who are all present during the whole time; and there is commonly a numerous attendance of Junior Students. Indeed there must of necessity

be an audience, because every candidate is bound to attend one examination before he is examined himself. The number, however, far exceeds what the Statute requires, and the School is often quite full. The Examiners are four in number, especially appointed by the University, and sworn to the faithful performance of their duty.

“If the student fails on this occasion, it passes *sub silentio*. He does not receive his certificate at the close of the day; and he may present himself again the next term.

“After having passed this Examination his studies are directed more steadily to the other, where the honour he acquires will depend entirely on his own exertions. He cannot present himself till after the third year is completed, and it is common to defer it till the end of the fourth year. He is then examined first in the rudiments of Religion: a passage in the Greek Testament is given him to construe, and he is tried by questions arising out of it, whether he has a proper view of the Christian scheme, and of the outline of sacred history. He is expected to give some account of the evidences of Christianity, and to shew by his answers that he is acquainted with the Thirty-nine Articles, and has read attentively some commentary upon them. He is examined again in Logic, the object being chiefly to see that he has just and firm conceptions of its leading principles; and, on this occasion, selections from the Organon are often introduced.

“The Examination then proceeds to Rhetoric and Ethics. Upon these subjects the celebrated treatises of Aristotle are chiefly used: and whoever is master of them knows what an exercise of the mind it is to acquire a thorough insight into the argument, and what a serious discipline the student must have undergone, who has accomplished this point. . . . To these is often added, at the option of the student, the treatise on Politics, which is in fact a continuation and a completion of the Ethical System.

“Besides these treatises of Aristotle, Quintilian as belonging to Rhetoric, and the philosophical works of Cicero, especially the *De Officiis*, as belonging to Ethics, are admitted. And these last, as being easier of attain-

ment, are of course the choice of many candidates. But neither of them are strictly indispensable.

“In examining *viva voce* almost two hundred candidates every year, nearly in the same departments, much skill and care is requisite lest a certain routine of questions be introduced, which a student may learn, and give to them some plausible answers, without having drawn his knowledge from the original source. Nothing but practice and constant vigilance, joined to a familiar acquaintance with the several books, can effectually guard against this abuse. And hence, to a bystander, the Examination may often seem vague and desultory, when the design only is, to probe the candidate here and there, and ascertain that his reading has been serious, not loose or superficial, or, as might sometimes happen, none at all.

“At this Examination the student presents what number of Classical Authors he pleases, provided that they be not less than three, including both languages. It is not unusual for those who aim at the highest honours to mention Homer, Pindar, one, two, or three of the Greek Tragedians and Aristophanes. Thucydides is seldom omitted. The other historians, and the orators, are also included, according as the student’s line of reading has been. Of Latin Authors, besides the poets of the Augustan age, Livy, Tacitus, Cicero, Juvenal and Lucretius, are the most usual. In the books that he names, he is expected to be well and accurately versed. . . .

“Besides the questions proposed *viva voce*, many others in the different branches of the Examination are put, and answered on paper, while other things are going on. And in this manner also the candidate’s knowledge of Latinity is tried.

“The Mathematical Examination is quite a distinct business. It is conducted indeed at the same time, but it is chiefly done on paper, if the student has advanced far in these studies; although for every candidate who presents himself in Mathematics there is an oral examination, in which, with a table of diagrams before him, he is called upon, not to give full and long demonstrations, but, as the Examiner turns over a corresponding table, to answer questions relating to the properties of figures, and

the mode of proving certain theorems. The soundness of his scientific studies is thus made known; and he has problems, which require time and close attention, to solve at his leisure on paper, while the Examiner passes on to others.

“It must be well known to every one who has had experience in life, that notwithstanding this formidable array of books and sciences, great numbers of candidates must be allowed to pass, whose attainments in both are, from various causes, very inconsiderable. Still if the system be so conducted as to encourage exertion, it would be absurd to reject those of the more moderate pretensions, who have passed through their period of residence with good conduct, and a tolerably regular attention to the prescribed duties. Nothing but extreme incapacity, extraordinary want of school education, or gross idleness at the University, will absolutely exclude a student from his Degree at the regular time. Of this description some few are found every year. But even these are not finally rejected; they may appear at the following Examination, and, unless the same insufficiency is again observed, generally pass.”

A companion picture of the methods in vogue at Cambridge is to be found in Whewell's *Of a Liberal Education*, p. 169, where he says, “I will copy Dr. Jebb's account of the exercises and examinations as they existed in 1772. This account was applicable with little alteration till 1827.”

Dr. Jebb's account is as follows:—“The Moderators are annually chosen upon the 10th of October. Their proper office is to preside alternately, at the public exercises of the students; and to examine them, at the time of their offering themselves for a Degree.

“These public exercises are held in the afternoon, for five days in the week during term time; the Moderator appearing a little before two, and frequently continuing in the schools till the clock strikes four.

“Upon the first Monday after the commencement of the January term, the Moderator, whose turn it is to preside, gives written notice to one of the students in his list, that it is his pleasure he should appear in the schools, as a disputant, on that day fortnight.

“This person, who is now called the respondent, in a

few hours after he has received the summons, waits upon the Moderator with three propositions or questions ; the truth of which he is to maintain against the objections of any three students of the same year, whom the Moderator shall think proper to nominate, and who on this occasion are called 'opponents.'"

Dr. Jebb then gives specimens of these questions¹ and continues:—

"A fortnight for preparation being expired, the respondent appears in the schools; he ascends the rostrum and reads a Latin dissertation (called with us a 'thesis') upon any one of the three questions he thinks proper; the Moderator attending in his place.

"As soon as the respondent has finished his thesis, which generally takes ten or fifteen minutes in the reading, the Moderator calls upon the first opponent to appear. He immediately ascends a rostrum opposite to the respondent, and proposes his 'arguments' against the questions in syllogistical form.

"Eight arguments, each consisting of three or four syllogisms, are brought up by the first opponent, five by the second, and three by the third.

"When the exercise has for some time been carried on according to the strict rules of logic, the disputation insensibly slides into free and unconfined debate. . . . The three opponents, having, in their turns, exhausted their whole stock of arguments, are dismissed by the Moderator in their order, with such a compliment² as in his estimation they deserve; and the exercise closes with the dismissal of the respondent in a similar manner.

"The Moderator, upon his return to his chambers, records the merits of the disputants by marks, set opposite to their respective names.

"This exercise, with the preparations for the subsequent examination in January, appears to be sufficient employment for the last year. And the apprehension of

¹ They are three in number and read as follows:—

Planetæ primarii retinentur in orbitis suis vi gravitatis, et motu projectili.

Iridis primariae et secundariae phœnomena solvi possunt ex principiis opticis.

Non licet magistratui civem morti tradere nisi ob crimen homicidii.

² For instance, *Optime disputasti.* Hence Senior and Junior Optimes.

it is so alarming, that the student, after two years and a quarter's residence, during which time no proof whatever of his proficiency is required, frequently seeks to avoid the difficulty or disgrace, by commencing fellow-commoner,¹ or, by declaring his intention of proceeding in Civil Law.

"These exercises being duly performed, the Vice-Chancellor appoints three days, in the beginning of the January term, for the examination of the 'Questionists': this being the appellation of the students, during the last six weeks of their preparation.

"The Moderators, some days before the arrival of the time prescribed, meet for the purpose of forming the students into divisions of six, eight, or ten, according to their performance in the schools, with a view to the ensuing examination.

"Upon the first of the appointed days, at eight o'clock in the morning, the students enter the Senate House, preceded by a Master of Arts from each College, who, on this occasion, is called the 'Father' of the College to which he belongs.

"After the Proctors have called over the names, each of the Moderators sends for a division of the students: they sit with him round a table, with pen, ink and paper before them: he enters upon his task of examination, and does not dismiss the set till the hour is expired. This Examination has now for some years been held in the English language.

"The Examination is varied according to the abilities of the students. The Moderator generally begins with proposing some questions from the six books of Euclid, Plane Trigonometry, and the first rules of Algebra. From the elements of mathematics a transition is made to the four branches of philosophy, viz. Mechanics, Hydrostatics, apparent Astronomy, and Optics. If the Moderator finds the set of Questionists capable of answering him, he proceeds to the eleventh and twelfth books of Euclid, Conic Sections, Spherical Trigonometry, the

¹ A Fellow-Commoner is an undergraduate who has commons, or in other words, dines with the Fellows at the high table in Hall, while the rest of the undergraduates sit at the lower tables. He pays higher fees for this privilege, and in the old days could take a Degree under easier conditions.

higher parts of Algebra, and Sir Isaac Newton's *Principia*. Having closed the philosophical examination, he sometimes asks a few questions in Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding*, Butler's *Analogy*, or Clarke's *Attributes*. But as the highest academical distinctions are invariably given to the best proficient in mathematics and natural philosophy, a very superficial knowledge in morality and metaphysics will suffice.

"When the division under examination is one of the higher classes, problems are also proposed, with which the student retires to a distant part of the Senate House, and returns, with his solution upon paper, to the Moderator, who, at his leisure, compares it with the solutions of the other students.

"When the clock strikes nine, the Questionists are dismissed to breakfast: they return at half-past nine, and stay till eleven; they go in again at half-past one, and stay till three; and lastly, they return at half-past three, and stay till five. On the third day they are finally dismissed at eleven."

Dr. Jebb also describes the continual examination of the students by the Father of the College, and how the latter makes a report of a student's absolute or comparative merit to the Moderators, and to every other Father who should ask him the question. He continues:—

"The Moderators and the Fathers meet at breakfast and dinner. From the variety of the reports, taken in connexion with their own examination, the former are enabled, about the close of the second day, so far to settle the comparative merits of the candidates, as to agree upon the names of four-and-twenty, who to them appear most deserving of being distinguished by marks of academical approbation.

"These four-and-twenty are recommended to the Proctors, for their private examinations, and, if approved by them, their names are set down in two divisions, according to that order, in which they deserve to stand; are afterwards printed; and read over upon a solemn day, in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor and of the assembled University. The names of the twelve who appear next in descent are read over upon a day subsequent to the former. Four additional names are generally inserted in

the former list (which is called the list of the Wranglers and Senior Optimes), at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, two Proctors, and the Senior Regent. In the latter list, or that of Junior Optimes, the number of twelve is almost constantly adhered to."

This was all that Oxford and Cambridge had to show in the way of knowledge-testing in the year 1800. The reader can now form his own opinion on the merits of the dispute between the *Edinburgh Review* and Copleston.

CHAPTER III.

THE SECOND ATTACK BY THE *EDINBURGH REVIEW*.

The second attack of the *Edinburgh Review* on the ancient Universities began in 1831 and continued till 1836. Sir William Hamilton was now the assailant, and his articles are to be found in the Education section of his collected *Discussions*, and the Education Appendix which contains his latest contribution to this subject.¹ He was well-equipped for the contest, for, as may be learned from the *Dictionary of National Biography*, he was himself an Oxford man, having entered Balliol College in 1807. The neglect of an eccentric Tutor left him to manage his own studies. So well did he look after himself that he gained the reputation of being the most learned Aristotelian in Oxford. He took a First Class in Litterae Humaniores, but did not obtain a Fellowship. He afterwards became Professor of Philosophy at Edinburgh, and was thus acquainted with two Universities from the inside. His unfortunate experiences at Oxford may to some extent account for the asperity with which he conducts his controversy with her.

Cardinal Newman, in the extract quoted above, says, "The second charge brought against its (Oxford's) studies was their connexion with a particular form of religious belief, or, in other words, their *religious exclusiveness*." This is by no means an adequate statement of the facts. It is true that Hamilton wrote an article, published in October 1834, "On the right of Dissenters to admission into the English Universities,"² and a supplemental article on the same subject in January 1835,³ but they are far exceeded in importance by his five other articles on the general question of University Reform. Of these the chief is that headed "Of the state of the English

¹ The second edition is the one quoted from.

² *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. LX., No. cxxi., pp. 202-230.

³ *Ib.* Vol. LX., No. cxxii., pp. 422-445.

Universities, with more especial reference to Oxford," published in June 1831¹ and a supplemental article bearing the same title published in December 1831. To these was afterwards added an Appendix, "On a Reform of the English Universities: with especial reference to Oxford; and limited to the Faculty of Arts."² In the *Discussions* the five articles are not given in strict chronological order, the four already mentioned being preceded by an article published in the *Edinburgh Review* in January 1836. This arrangement is doubtless intentional, as will now be shown.

In 1835 Dr. Whewell, then Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, published a pamphlet entitled *Thoughts on the Study of Mathematics as a part of a Liberal Education*. It ran to between 40 and 50 octavo pages. The first few pages discuss the respective merits of mathematics and logic as aids to exact reasoning; the middle part sets forth various points in which the writer considered current mathematical teaching to be wrong, and finally we reach the practical inferences which Whewell wishes to be drawn from what has gone before. This modest publication produced a furious onslaught from Hamilton, who was against anything beyond an irreducible minimum of mathematics as a part of a liberal education.³ Mathematics, he contended, were not philosophy, nor an improving study, did not conduce to generalisation, were not a logical study, nor a logical exercise; on the contrary, they induced credulity and scepticism. It would have been unnecessary to refer to this controversy, but for the fact that Hamilton incidentally dealt some shrewd blows at Cambridge and its favourite study. "The centre," he writes, "from which (this pamphlet) proceeds, enhances also the interest of the publication. In opposition to the general opinion of the learned world,—in opposition to the practice of all other Universities, past or present,—

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. LIII., No. cvi., pp. 384-427, and Vol. LIV., No. cviii., pp. 478-504. Republished in the *Discussions* at pp. 401 and 450.

² *Discussions*, p. 742.

³ See his article "On the Study of Mathematics as an Exercise of Mind," *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. LXII., No. cxxvi., pp. 409-455. *Discussions*, p. 263.

in opposition even to its oaths and statutes, the University of Cambridge stands alone in *now* making mathematical science the principal object of the whole liberal education it affords; and mathematical skill the sole condition of the one tripos of its honours, and the necessary passport to the other:—thus restricting to the narrowest proficiency all places of distinction and emolument in University and College, to which such honours constitute a claim;—thus also leaving the immense majority of its alumni without incitement, and the most arduous and important studies void of encouragement and reward. It is true, indeed, that the effect of this contracted tendency of the *public University* is, in some degree, tempered by certain favourable accidents in the constitution of more than one of its *private colleges*; but with every allowance for petty and precarious counteraction, and latterly for some very inadequate legislation, the University of Cambridge, unless it can demonstrate that mathematical study is the *one best*, if not the one exclusive, means of a general evolution of our faculties, must be held to have established and maintained a scheme of discipline, more partial and inadequate than any other which the history of education records. That no Cambridge mathematician has yet been found to essay this demonstration, so necessary for his University, so honourable to his science, has always appeared to us a virtual admission, that the thesis was incapable of defence.”¹

Whewell sent a letter to the *Edinburgh Review* complaining that the Reviewer had not fairly stated the purport of his pamphlet. Hamilton retorted with a note of great length. This time he has a slash at the Colleges as well as at the University. In a note to his note² he says: “It is only a private and intrusive interest which has there (at Cambridge) superseded the public seminary, and this has calculated for the advantage of its members, and not for the national good, the education which Cambridge has long been permitted to dispense. This private interest is that of the Colleges and of their Tutors; and in Cambridge there has for generations been taught,

¹ *Discussions*, pp. 264-5.

² *Ib.*, p. 333.

not what the ends of education, not what the ends of science prescribe, but only *what*, and that *what how*, the College Tutors are capable of teaching. It would be here out of place (and is indeed done elsewhere) to explain the manner in which a mere Collegio-Tutorial instruction must be scanty and mechanical, and why the mechanism once made up, remains, and must remain, long after the opinions which it chances to comprehend and teach are elsewhere exploded. Suffice it for an example, to take the remarkable, the notorious fact: that fifty, that sixty years after Newton had published his Principia, the physical hypothesis of Descartes was still tutorially inculcated in Newton's own University. In fact, I believe that the Cambridge Colleges were about the *last* seminaries throughout Europe in which the Newtonian doctrine superseded the Cartesian, and this too in opposition to the Professorial authority of Newton himself, and of his successors in the Public Chair. And why? Simply, because in these Colleges, instruction was dispensed by Tutors, for their own convenience and advantage; and these Tutors, educated in the old routine, were unable or unwilling to re-educate themselves for teachers of the new truth. This is an example of the value of Collegial, of Tutorial, *authority* in Cambridge; and we may be sure, that whatever are the subjects comprised in the tutorial mechanism of the time, will be clamorously asserted by the collegial interest to be the best possible subjects of academical education; while all beyond it, all especially that cannot be reduced to a catechetical routine, will be as clamorously decried."

These extracts may be regarded as merely the skirmishes subsidiary to the main attack, but they show the line it was to take—a line which Hamilton followed with a persistency and a vehemence almost amounting to an obsession. This main attack had been made by Hamilton in June 1831, in the article already mentioned, "Of the state of the English Universities, with more especial reference to Oxford." The year, as everyone knows, was one of great political excitement which culminated in the passage of the first Reform Bill in 1832. "This is the age of reform," begins Hamilton. "Next in importance to our religious and political establishments, are the foundations

for public education; and having now seriously engaged in a reform of 'the constitution, the envy of surrounding nations,' the time cannot be distant for a reform in the schools and universities which have hardly avoided their contempt. . . We commence with Oxford. This University is entitled to precedence, from its venerable antiquity, its ancient fame, the wealth of its endowments, and the importance of its privileges."¹

The plan of campaign is shown in the following sentence: "It is not in demonstrating the imperfection of the present system, that we principally ground a hope of its improvement; it is in demonstrating its *illegality*. . . It will not surely be contended that matters should continue as they are, if it can be shown that, as now administered, the University pretends only to accomplish a petty fraction of the ends proposed to it by law, and attempts even this only by illegal means."

To effect this object Hamilton employs the historical method. "When this article was written," he says, "the history of our oldest Universities had fallen into oblivion; their parts and principles were not understood, even by themselves; nay, opinions universally accepted touching the most essential points of their constitution, were not only erroneous, but precisely the reverse of truth. Criticism was therefore requisite; and a correction of the more important errors,—this a collection of original documents, which I had succeeded in forming, has enabled me (I hope unostentatiously) to accomplish. . . The vices of the present system have been observed, and frequently discussed; but as it has never been shown in what manner these vices were generated, so it has never been perceived how easily their removal might be enforced.

"It is generally believed that, however imperfect in itself, the actual mechanism of education organised in these seminaries (Oxford and Cambridge) is a time-honoured and essential part of their being, established upon statute, endowed by the national legislature with exclusive privileges, and inviolable as

¹ *Discussions*, pp. 401, 402.

a vested right. We shall prove, on the contrary, that it is as new as it is inexpedient,—not only accidental to the University, but radically subversive of its constitution,—without legal sanction, nay, in violation of positive law,—arrogating the privileges exclusively conceded to another system, which it has superseded,—and so far from being defensible by those it profits, as a right, that it is a flagrant usurpation, obtained through perjury, and only tolerated from neglect.”¹ *Illegality and perjury*—these are the terms which continually recur throughout all the articles.

Hamilton next sets forth the nature and constitution of the two Universities.

“Oxford and Cambridge, as establishments for education, consist of two parts,—of the *University proper*, and the *Colleges*. The former, original and essential, is founded, controlled and privileged by public authority, for the advantage of the nation. The latter, accessory and contingent; are created, regulated and endowed by private munificence, for the interest of certain favoured individuals. Time was, when the Colleges did not exist, and the University was there; and were the Colleges again abolished, the University would remain entire. The former, founded solely for education, exists only as it accomplishes the end of its institution; the latter, founded principally for aliment and habitation, would still exist, were all education abandoned within their walls. The University, as a national establishment, is necessarily open to the lieges in general; the Colleges, as private institutions, might universally do, as some have actually done,—close their gates upon all, except their foundation members.

“The University and the Colleges are thus neither identical, nor vicarious of each other. If the University ceases to perform its functions, it ceases to exist; and the privileges accorded by the nation to the system of public education legally organised in the University, cannot, without the consent of the nation,—far less without the consent of the academical legislature,—be lawfully transferred to the system of private education pre-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 400, 403.

cariously organised in the Colleges, over which neither the State nor the University has any control. *They have, however, been unlawfully usurped.*"

The result is thus depicted:—"Through the suspension of the University, and the usurpation of its functions and privileges by the Collegial bodies, there has arisen the second of two systems, diametrically opposite to each other. The one, in which the University was paramount, is ancient and statutory; the other, in which the Colleges have the ascendant, is recent and illegal. In the former, all was subservient to public utility, and the interests of science; in the latter, all is sacrificed to private monopoly, and to the convenience of the teacher. The former amplified the means of education in accommodation to the mighty end which a University proposes; the latter limits the end which the University attempts to the capacity of the petty instruments which the intrusive system employs.—The one afforded education in all the Faculties; the other professes to furnish only elementary tuition in the lowest. In the authorised system, the cycle of instruction was distributed among a body of teachers, all professedly chosen for merit, and each concentrating his ability on a single object; in the unauthorised, every branch, necessary to be learned, is monopolised by an individual, privileged to teach all, though probably ill-qualified to teach any.—The old system daily collected into large classes, under the same Professor, the whole youth of the University of equal standing, and thus rendered possible a keen and constant and unremitted competition; the new, which elevates the Colleges and Halls into so many little Universities, and in these houses distributes the students, without regard to ability or standing, among some fifty Tutors, frustrates all emulation among the members of its small and ill-assorted classes.—In the superseded system, the Degrees in all the Faculties were solemn testimonials that the graduate had accomplished a regular course of study in the public schools of the University, and approved his competence by exercise and examination; and on these Degrees, only as such testimonials, and solely for the public good, were there bestowed by the civil legislature, great and exclusive privileges, in the Church, in the Courts of Law, and in the

practice of medicine. In the superseding system, Degrees in all the Faculties, except the lowest department of the lowest, certify neither a course of academical study, nor any ascertained proficiency in the graduate; and these now nominal distinctions retain their privileges to the public detriment, and for the benefit only of those by whom they have been deprived of their significance.”¹

Hamilton having thus stated his case in general terms proceeds to prove it in detail. He first briefly sets forth the system *de jure*. As was pointed out in the Introductory Chapter of this book, the *Corpus Statutorum* by which Oxford was nominally governed in 1831 was that drawn up under the influence of Laud, and solemnly ratified by King, Chancellor and Convocation in 1636. In 1831 every member of the University was still solemnly bound by oath and subscription to their faithful observance. It will be seen hereafter how much Hamilton makes of this last fact. He then points out that in the original constitution of Oxford, the University was governed and taught by the graduates at large. Professor, Master, Doctor were originally synonymous. Every graduate was under the obligation of teaching publicly, for a certain period, the subjects of his Faculty, for such was the condition involved in the grant of the Degree itself. A Bachelor, or imperfect graduate, was bound to read a course of lectures under a Master or Doctor in his Faculty; and the Master, Doctor or perfect graduate was, after his promotion, obliged immediately to commence, (*incipere*,) and to continue for a certain period publicly to teach, (*regere*,) some at least of the subjects appertaining to his Faculty. Such men were called *necessary regents*, but as there were many *voluntary regents*, the original period of necessary regency was once again abbreviated, and even a dispensation from actual teaching, during its continuance, commonly allowed. The Regents alone were allowed to enjoy full privileges in University legislation and government; in Oxford, the Regents constituted the House of Congregation, while the House of Convocation consisted of all the Regents and non-Regents *resident in the University*. It

¹ *Ib.* pp. 404, 405.

was only by a fiction that those were subsequently held to be *Convictores*, or actual residents in the University, who retained their names on the books of a Hall or College.¹

This system of instruction by the graduates at large was modified by the rise of the *Professors*. The Regents were entitled to exact from their auditors a certain regulated fee. To relieve the scholars of this burden, and to secure the services of able teachers, salaries were sometimes given to certain graduates, on consideration of their delivery of lectures without collect or fee. It was to these salaried graduates that the title of *Professors* was at last peculiarly attributed. The unsalaried Regents found their schools deserted for the gratuitous instruction of the privileged lecturers, and so dispensation from teaching came to be universally accorded to the other graduates. "The scheme thus established in *law*, though now abolished in *fact*, is as follows:—Education is afforded in all the Faculties in which Degrees are granted, by the University itself, through its accredited organs, the *Public Readers* or *Professors*—a regular attendance on whose lectures during a stated period is in every Faculty *indispensably* requisite to qualify for a Degree."

Hamilton next sketches the rise of the Tutorial system which was destined so largely to overshadow the Professorial. He says, "But besides the public and principal means of instruction afforded by the Professors and other Regents in the University, the student was subjected until his first Degree to the subsidiary and private discipline of a *Tutor* in the Hall or College to which he belonged." This step was rendered necessary by the extreme youthfulness of the undergraduates. "With this, however, as a merely private concern, the University did not interfere; . . . the Tutorial office was viewed as one of very subordinate importance in the statutory system. *To commence tutor*, it was only necessary for a student to have the lowest Degree in Arts, and that his learning and character should be approved by the Head of his House, or, in the event of controversy on this point, by the Vice-Chancellor. All that was expected of him was 'to imbue his pupils with

¹ *Ib.* note, p. 407.

good principles and institute them in approved authors; but above all in the rudiments of religion, and the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles. . . It is also his duty to contain his pupils within statutory regulations in matters of external appearance, such as their clothes, boots and hair; which if the pupils are found to transgress, the Tutor for the first, second, and third offence, shall forfeit six and eightpence, and for the fourth, shall be interdicted from his tutorial function by the Vice-Chancellor." "Who could have anticipated from this Statute," exclaims Hamilton, "what the Tutor was ultimately to become?"¹

But if the above be the theory, the existing fact is far different. "The University is in abeyance. . . In none of the Faculties is it supposed that the Professors any longer furnish the instruction necessary for a degree. . . It is not even pretended that Oxford any longer supplies more than the preliminary of an academical education. Even this is not afforded by the University but is abandoned to the Colleges and Halls; and now, therefore, Oxford is not *one public University*, but merely a *collection of many private schools*. The University, in fact, exists only in semblance, for the behoof of the unauthorised seminaries by which it has been replaced, and which have contrived, under covert of its name, to slip into possession of its public privileges." Hamilton here cites the passage quoted above from p. 183 of Copleston's Reply, that "The University of Oxford is not a national foundation," and remarks that it shows "how completely the *University* is annihilated,—how completely even *all memory of its history, all knowledge of its constitution, have perished at Oxford*. He quotes in refutation Dr. Wallis, some time Registrar, who speaks of the "Colleges which we now have *being accidental to the corporation of the University*."

Hamilton continues:—"As academical education was usurped by the Tutors from the Professors,—so all tutorial education was usurped by the *Fellows* from the other graduates. The *Fellows* exclusively teach all that Oxford now deems necessary to be taught; . . (but) as

¹ *Ib.* p. 411.

the Fellowships were not founded for the purposes of teaching, so the qualifications that constitute a Fellow are not those that constitute an instructor. The 'close' system of Fellowships was, of course, to blame for this result. *As at present organised*, it is a doubtful problem whether the Tutorial system ought not to be abated as a nuisance. . . . But the Tutorial system as now dominant in Oxford is vicious: 1st, in its *application*, as usurping the place of the Professorial, whose functions it is inadequate to discharge; 2nd, in its *constitution*—the Tutors as now appointed being incompetent even for subsidiary instruction.”¹

Hamilton then turns to his second subject of consideration:—“How the English Universities, and in particular Oxford, passed from a *legal* to an *illegal* state, and from *public*, were degraded into *private*, *schools*?—The answer is precise: *This was effected solely by the influence, and exclusively for the advantage of the Colleges.*” To support his contention he gives a sketch of the Collegial system as it sprang up and developed in Paris, Louvain, and Germany, and more especially at Oxford. At the latter place the steps were three:—

(1) By the beginning of the fifteenth century it had become established by law that all scholars should be members of some College, Hall, or Entry, under a responsible Head. The latter houses of community, variously called Halls, Inns, Hostels, Entries, were governed by statutes established by the University, by whom also they were visited and reformed, and administered by a Principal, elected by the scholars themselves, but admitted to his office by the Chancellor on finding caution for payment of the rent. In a few Houses, foundations were made for the support of a certain number of indigent scholars, who were incorporated as *Fellows* (or joint participators in the endowment), under the government of a Head. But a mistake was made in not limiting these benefactions to learners and instructors, while the subjection of the *Colleges* to private statutes and their emancipation from the control of the academical authorities, gave them interests apart from

¹ *Ib.* p. 417.

those of the public and rendered them instead of aids to the Universities, the worst impediments to their utility. "The Colleges, into which Commoners, or members not on the foundation, were, until a comparatively modern date, rarely admitted, (and this admission, be it noted, is to the present hour wholly optional) remained for many centuries few in comparison with the Halls. The Reformation played havoc with the Halls.¹ From being thirty at the beginning of the fifteenth century, they had fallen at Oxford to four or five in 1831. The collegial interest, being thus left without a counterpoise, was soon able to establish an absolute supremacy in the University."²

(2) The Fellows next monopolised the office of Tutor. By University law, graduates were not compelled to lodge in College; Colleges therefore excluded them to make room for undergraduates who paid fees, and also to prevent their becoming Tutors. Sir William Hamilton, in his supplemental article further elaborates this point.³ "All inconveniences and dangers would be obviated, and profitably obviated, if standing on College books were allowed to count for statutory residence in the University. By this expedient (which we have failed formerly to notice) a revenue of indefinite amount might be realized to the Colleges, by taxing standing on their books with the dues exigible from actual residence."

(3) Collegial tuition thus finally displacing Professorial tuition, the University was silently annihilated, and the Colleges succeeded to its privileges, and its place. Not that this end was ever clearly proposed, or a line of policy for its attainment ever systematically followed out. But circumstances concurred, and the instinct of self-interest determined a result such as no sagacity would have anticipated as possible.

It was Laud who changed the original republican polity into an oligarchy. "The government of the University (of Oxford) was of old exclusively committed to the Masters and Doctors assembled in Congregation and Convocation; Heads of Houses and College Fellows

¹ In Cambridge they were known as Hostels. These came to an end in 1540. The Halls there are Colleges, *i.e.* incorporated foundations.

² *Ib.* p. 432.

³ *Ib.* p. 459.

shared in academical government only as they were full Graduates, and as they were Regents." Laud left the legislation and the supreme government with the full graduates, but he clothed the Heads of Houses with an authority which rendered them the sole administrators of the University weal. The Vice-Chancellor, (now also necessarily a *College Head*,) the Heads of Houses and the two Proctors were constituted into a Hebdomadal Meeting, and no proposal could be submitted to Congregation or Convocation unless it had been previously sanctioned by the Meeting. The interests and the duties of the Heads were thus diametrically opposed. By statute they were bound to maintain and improve the University or Professorial system of teaching. Their interests lay in the aggrandisement of their own Colleges, and their interests prevailed. "The Professorial system, though still imperfect, could without difficulty have been carried to unlimited perfection; but the Heads fostered its defects, in order to precipitate its fall.¹ . . . With the Colleges and Fellows it was *all or nothing*. If they were not to continue, as they had been, mere accessories to the University, it behoved to *quash the whole public lectures and to dispense with residence after the elementary degree*. This the Heads of Houses easily effected."²

Hamilton uses much strong language on this point. He says³: "The great interests of the nation, of the Church, and of the professions were sacrificed to the paltry ends of a few contemptible Corporations; and the privileges by law accorded to the *public University* of Oxford, as the authorised organ of national education, were by its perfidious governors furtively transferred to the unauthorised absurdities of their *private*—of their *domestic discipline*"; and again: "The Heads of Houses rather than expose the College usurpations to a discussion by the academical and civil legislatures, not only submitted to the disgrace of leaving their smuggled system of education without a legal sanction, but actually tolerated the reproach of thus converting the great seminary of the English Church into a *school of perjury*,

¹ p. 438.² pp. 440-1.³ p. 441.

without, as far as we know, an effort either at vindication or amendment." He grounds this charge on the oath which undergraduates took on entrance, and repeated at each step of graduation. The Statutes which are thus sworn to, "*establish the University on the system of Professorial instruction, and they do not come under the power of Dispensation.*" Hamilton quotes from the "*Epinomis or explanation of the oath taken by all*" this passage among others: "Finally as the reverence due to their character exempts the MAGISTRATES OF THE UNIVERSITY from the common penalties of other transgressors *so on them there is incumbent a stronger conscientious obligation.* . . But since the keeping and guardianship of the Statutes is intrusted to their fidelity, if (may it never happen) through their negligence or sloth, they suffer any statutes whatever to fall into desuetude, and silently, as it were to be abrogated, in that event, WE DECREE THEM GUILTY OF BROKEN FAITH AND OF PERJURY."¹

As a remedy for the evils complained of Hamilton advocated a visitation by the Crown, doubtless in the shape of a Royal Commission. Public opinion, however enlightened, could not "be expected to induce a majority of the collegial bodies voluntarily to surrender the monopoly they have so long enjoyed, and to descend to a subordinate position, after having occupied a principal. All experience proves, that Universities, like other Corporations, can only be reformed from without. A Committee of Visitation has lately terminated its labours on the Scottish Universities: we should anticipate a more important result from a similar, and far more necessary, inquiry into the corruptions of those of England."²

The Oxford reply came speedily in the shape of a bulky pamphlet entitled "The Legality of the present Academical System of the University of Oxford asserted against the new Calumnies of the *Edinburgh Review*." Hamilton made answer in a second article in the *Edinburgh Review*,³ which he terms an "amplified recapitulation" of his first. The reply and the counter-reply are a melancholy example of the tendency of con-

¹ *Ib.* p. 445.

² *Ib.* pp. 448, 449.

³ Vol. LIV., No. cviii., pp. 478-504.

troversy to evolve heat rather than light. All criticisms of the Universities are "calumnies," and Hamilton writes thus of the Oxford pamphlet, "The plain scope of the publication is to defend perjury by imposture; and its contents are one tissue of disingenuous concealments, false assertions, forged quotations, and infuriate railings."¹ In an "amplified recapitulation" there is necessarily much repetition, but some additional facts of minor importance are given in support of the "formal charge of *Illegality, Treason, Perjury and Corruption.*"²

It may be noted that Hamilton here makes plain the quarter from which he hoped for deliverance. "A Royal or Parliamentary visitation is the easy and appropriate way of solving the difficulty." Before the Leicester and Laud legislation "the University possessed within itself the ordinary means of reform; Convocation frequently appointed delegates to inquire into abuses, and to take counsel for the welfare and melioration of the establishment. But by bestowing on a private body, like the Heads, the exclusive guardianship of the Statutes, and the initiative of every legal measure, Convocation was deprived of the power of active interference. . . . To the administrators of the State, rather than to the administrators of the University are thus primarily to be attributed the corruptions of Oxford. To them, likewise, must we look for their removal. The Crown is, in fact, bound, in justice to the nation, to restore the University against the consequences of its own imprudence and neglect. And as it ought, so is it alone able. . . . With a patriot King, a reforming Ministry, and a reformed Parliament, we are confident that our expectations will not be vain. A general scholastic reform will be, in fact, one of the greatest blessings of the political renovation, and, perhaps, the surest test of its value."³ These high hopes were not realised till 1850, and then only partially.

As Newman points out, Hamilton also discussed the "religious exclusiveness" of the two Universities. But even when he was affirming the right of Dissenters to admission into the English Universities, he could only view the question from the standpoint which he had

¹ *Discussions*, p. 454.

² *Ib.* p. 452.

³ *Ib.* pp. 471-472.

made so peculiarly his own. He makes this fact abundantly clear by the first sentence of his article¹:—"The whole difficulty of the question, in regard to the admission of Dissenters into the English Universities, lies in the present anomalous state—we do not say constitution—of these establishments. In them the *University*, properly so called, *i.e.* the necessary national establishment for general education, is at present illegally suspended, and its function usurped, but not performed, by a number of private institutions which have sprung up in accidental connection with it, named *Colleges*."

Hamilton thus found himself in a difficulty. "The claim," he writes, "of the Dissenters to admission into the *public University* cannot justly be refused," but there was, in his view, no public University into which to admit them. He adds: "The actual, that is the *present*, right of the Colleges, as private establishments, to close their gates on all but members of their own foundations, cannot be denied; independently of this right, the expediency is worse than doubtful, either, on the one hand, of forcing a College to receive inmates, not bound to accommodate themselves to its religious observances, or, on the other, of exacting from those entitled to admission, conformity to religious observances, in opposition to their faith."² His solution is to be found in the following words³: "We think the difficulty may be overcome, by simply returning to the ancient practice of the English Universities, in regard to the easy establishment of Halls or Hostels." Hamilton's second article on this subject goes over the whole ground again and the charge of perjury appears once more in capital letters. Those who are curious in this last matter may consult the passage beginning "Oxford is now a national school of perjury."⁴

Hamilton afterwards published an Appendix, "On a reform of the English Universities, with especial reference to Oxford; and limited to the Faculty of Arts."⁵ Internal evidence shows that it was written in 1847 and revised in 1853. Though it was not published in the *Edinburgh Review* it was promised in the first of the two articles

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Oct. 1834.

² *Discussions*, p. 479.

³ *Ib.* p. 489.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 553-554.

⁵ *Ib.* pp. 742-832.

already dealt with, and may be most conveniently considered in connexion therewith. It is divided into two parts, *Oxford as it is*, and *Oxford as it might be*. The first begins with an elaborate investigation into the merits of the various Oxford Colleges as tested by their successes in the Schools during the ten-year period ending in 1847. Balliol then as now stands at the head of the list, while “*four Houses (two Colleges and two Halls), containing above a hundred undergraduates, have during the decade no First Class Honours at all.*” This in *Litterae Humaniores*. In *Disciplinae Mathematicae*, “*seven Houses (three Colleges and four Halls), and with an average of undergraduates considerably above two hundred, shew no First Class Honours; and of these, two (a College and a Hall) have no Honours, even of the lowest.*” The conclusion is that “*some of the Oxford Houses, throwing out the worst, and judging only by the most favourable criterion—that some of the Oxford Houses now perform, as academical instruments,—five,—ten,—fifteen,—ay twenty times more than others.*” By a further table efficiency is proved to vary directly as the qualifications of the Instructors. “*Only a single College (Balliol) has all its instructors, and these amount to five, of the Highest Class; whereas, in three, no instructor whatever exhibited a similar Honour.*”

Hamilton then passes to “the remarkable contrast of a College with itself, in respect of its comparative efficiency at one period, and its comparative inefficiency at another,” and illustrates this fact by the case of Christ Church, during the thirty years from the first institution of classified examinations for the degree in 1807, and also the ten years from 1838 to 1847 inclusive. Taking Double Firsts, in the *three* decades, Christ Church has *twenty-nine*, whilst all the other Houses have, among them, only *thirty-two*, i.e. Christ Church has in proportion to its undergraduates 1 in 6, and the rest of the University 1 in 42. In the *one* decade (1838-1847) things are marvellously changed. “For while the other Houses maintain the proportion of 1 in 45; Christ Church, having now *no* Double First, sinks to the negative proportion of 0 in 186,—*disappears.*” Similar results are obtained by comparing the Honours

in Litterae Humaniores and Mathematics. "Such is the remarkable contrast of a College, in the spirit of study, to itself; Christ Church, in the former period, rising as proudly far above the level of the University, as, in the latter, it has subsided humbly far beneath it."

Of the defects here mentioned one has practically disappeared. The cases of a man of inferior degree being elected to a College office either at Oxford or Cambridge are now very rare. The inequality of the work done by the individual Colleges and their fluctuations both in numbers and efficiency still remain, and will some day attract the attention they deserve.

Oxford as it might be begins with an examination into the abstract ends of Universities in general. These are defined as three:—(1) "to supply competent instruction; (2) to excite the requisite exertion; and (3) to grant a true certificate of proficiency."¹ The ends are subsequently expanded into:—

First as to what a University should teach. "As a University cannot teach the *omne scibile*, and as there is an order and subordination among the departments of knowledge; a University is bound to secure by preference those studies which are necessary, not only on their own account, but for the sake of ulterior progress. In other words: a University, though it cannot compass the cycle of knowledge, is required to supply its introduction. This manifest principle has, however, too frequently been neglected in our modern Universities—nay even reversed. Teaching everything, they teach nothing."²

Second end. "A University should supply competent, and exclude incompetent instructors."

Third end. "A University should place conspicuously before the eyes of the student high living examples of erudition and ability."

Fourth end. "A University is bound to supply such external incitement to the student as may render his studies more pleasurable than their intermission," *i.e.* there must be "the refreshment of honour, and the stimulus of competition."

¹ *Ib.* p. 764.

² *Ib.* p. 765.

Fifth end. "A University, in its liberal faculty, should prefer those objects of study which call forth the strongest and most unexclusive energy of thought." Its educational exercises should be 1. Examination; 2. Disputation; 3. Repetition; 4. Written Composition; 5. Teaching in order to learn; 6. Conversation with, and questioning of the learned; 7. Social study.

Sixth end. "A University is further bound to grant Degrees."

Seventh end. A University ought to teach the physical sciences because they require costly experiments, apparatus and collected objects.¹ Later on he says, "The knowledge which depends on the ocular demonstration of costly collections and experiments;—this knowledge, easy and palpable, requiring an appliance more of the senses than of the understanding, can be fully taught to all, at once, by one competent demonstrator. The teaching of the natural sciences, therefore, ought to be *Professional*."

Eighth end. "A University ought to supply a complement of books with every convenience for consultation and reading."

Ninth end. "A University should likewise possess a competent board of regulation and academical patronage."

Tenth end. "A University should be able to offer some not inadequate reward for the ability and learning required in its instructors," in other words, teaching ought to be made a career.

Eleventh end. A University ought to have a Pension Fund.

Twelfth end and last. A University should, if possible, afford to its alumni the means of living academically together.² But if certain conditions are not fulfilled, the evil of such an arrangement may greatly outweigh the good; but the enforcement of this regulation should not act as a tax. The students should be able to live as cheaply in the privileged Houses of a University as they could in private lodgings.

¹ Hamilton regarded the Natural Sciences as peculiarly fitted to the Pass or Poll Man, whom he would retain (p. 761).

² *Ib.* p. 785.

The Third Part is entitled "Comparison of the Means now at work, especially in Oxford, and the Ends there actually effected, with the Ends which a University ought to accomplish." The great criticism here is that Oxford and the rest of the Universities do not teach Philosophy.

Oxford is next tested by each of the above twelve ends, and is found to be deficient in every case.

Finally Hamilton turns to "Oxford as it might be." "I do not mean," he writes, "to hazard the suggestion of measures which would realise the ideal of a perfect University. It is self-evident that if Fellowships and Headships, etc., were made the just rewards of academical merit, these offices would constitute an apparatus of powerful agencies, which, as they have hitherto impeded, would now be turned to promote the ends of the University. But this, however I may wish, I would not venture to propose." The present generation of reformers may with good reason be more courageous.

Hamilton continues, "In restoring the public reality of education against the private and usurping semblance—in restoring the University against the Colleges, we ought not to imitate the precedent of the Houses, we ought not to swamp them. Our policy should be directly the converse. Let 'Reform' not 'Rescind' be the word. Restoring the University we should not supersede the Colleges; but, on the contrary, enable the best of the Colleges to do far more than they can now accomplish, and compel the worst to become the rivals of the best." A two-fold division of the subject is then made—into (a) Things primary or constitutive; and (b) Things secondary or complemental. Under (a) are included (1) *The Objects of Instruction*; (2) *The Instructors*; (3) *The Instruction*; (4) *The Excitement to study*; (5) *The Degree*, or certificate of proficiency.

Under (1) Hamilton reiterates his complaint of the omission of Philosophy from the curriculum.

Under (2) there is a long discussion of the rival merits of Professorial and Tutorial teaching, *i.e.* of teaching by the University and teaching by the Colleges, the main contention being "that in so far as higher individual learning and ability afford a superior instruction, the Professorial system, if properly organised, is preferable

to the Tutorial, even at the best." But in so far as the efficiency of an education depends on the greater number of such teachers, the Professorial is inferior to the Tutorial. Each has thus its separate utilities. Hamilton's suggested plan was "to draw the Tutors from their isolation in the private House, and to employ them *in larger or smaller pluralities, in exercising the academical alumni collected into University or public classes.* . . . A plurality of Tutors can do what can be done by no individual Professor." The Tutors were of course to take the *Primary Highest Honours*, but their appointment was not to be withdrawn from the Collegial Head. "At the same time, in the smaller Colleges, it might be advantageous, if two at least combined, and had in common a single complement of Tutors." Hamilton even argued that one condition—a sufficiency of academically authorised books, gave a decided advantage to the Tutorial over the Professorial system of education.

He winds up thus: "It would in my humble opinion be far safer to elevate the education at Oxford by Tutors, than, subverting that, to return to its old education by Professors, (still statutory though this be,) even with the best prospects of improvement." In a subsequently written Note he further upholds this proposition and expresses his disapproval of Mr. Bonamy Price's views as set forth in his pamphlet, "Suggestions for the extension of Professorial teaching in the University of Oxford." There would thus be *collegio-tutorial* classes for the students to begin with, to be followed by *academico-tutorial* classes of a more advanced character. It follows of necessity that the University is bound to select special books, as the materials of explanation by the Tutors in the Colleges, and of exercise by the Tutors in the Schools. For this work a Board of Studies must be instituted. The academical courses collected and composed by such Boards in other Universities are "some of the most valuable contributions which have ever been made to learning and philosophy."

A minor reform which Hamilton incidentally advocates was the abolition of the various grades—Nobleman, Fellow Commoner, etc. He would have had all students admitted on a footing of equality as Pensioners.

Hamilton had his own ideas about Examinations and Degrees. He viewed with the greatest suspicion both the new Triposes at Cambridge and the new Schools at Oxford, which he regarded as an imitation of them. His peculiar views on Mathematics have already been stated. He was equally severe on Science. "The Natural Sciences," he says, "are essentially easy; requiring comparatively little talent for their promotion, and only the most ordinary capacity for their acquisition. Their study, therefore, does not cultivate the mind." He would accordingly have given degrees of different value for different subjects. The highest honours he would have confined to two departments, *Humane Letters*, and *Philosophy*. Humane Letters "should in a great measure be limited to the domain of Greek and Roman letters." Philosophy would comprehend in its proximate sphere, Psychology, Logic, Morals, Politics; in a less proximate sphere, Grammar, Rhetoric, Poetic; and in a remoter sphere, Mathematics and the Natural Sciences. These last, therefore, would not be rewarded with the highest honours. Our author's views on Examinations, including the comparative rating of books and the adding together of the marks obtained in a first and second part, may strike the reader as fantastic, but Hamilton at least saw the necessity of making Examinations systematic and scientific, and he held that the new Schools at Oxford were neither the one nor the other. In fact if they were persisted in, he threatened to withdraw his opinion that "Oxford was the British University susceptible of the easiest and most effectual regeneration."

Things secondary and supplemental include (1) a scheme of academical *Patronage* and *Regulation* accommodated to the circumstances of the English Universities, and (2) a scheme for the erection of new *Halls*. New Halls should be erected (*a*) to supply additional demand for entrance, (*b*) to prevent a slovenly tuition in the older Houses, (*c*) to keep down expense and afford a cheaper education to poor students, (*d*) to accommodate Dissenters, (*e*) to reward academical zeal and ability especially in their Headships.

Other measures under this head are only named.

They are a *general taxation of the necessary collegial expenses, the means of remunerating the academical instructors, of retaining talent in the University, of pensioning emeriti, libraries, musea.*

According to the *Dictionary of National Biography* Sir William Hamilton's articles in the *Edinburgh Review* had one astonishing result. They led to an attempt at legislation in the House of Lords. It was the Earl of Radnor who took action. The noble lord had already distinguished himself for his zeal in the cause of religious liberty, having in 1835 brought in a Bill to do away with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles at the Universities. In the year 1837 he introduced the Bill to which the *Dictionary of National Biography* refers. It recited that the Colleges and Halls established at Oxford and Cambridge are possessed of great estates and funds, bestowed with the intention of providing for poor and indigent persons, of promoting religion and virtue, and of encouraging learning and the liberal arts; that many of such Colleges and Halls were founded in times of remote antiquity, and nearly all of them before the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and that the statutes prescribed by the original founders had been altered, and latterly many even of their more recent statutes had also been long and habitually disregarded in the ordinary administration of their affairs. The Bill accordingly enacted that Commissioners should be appointed by the King, under the Great Seal, to enquire into the amount, nature and application of the estates and funds of the said Colleges and Halls, and into the said statutes and the ordinary administration of the affairs of each College and Hall, and also how far the said estates and funds might be made more conducive to the objects intended by the founders and benefactors, and for which they were endowed, and to the diffusion of religion and virtue, and the encouragement of learning and the liberal arts.

The second reading of this Bill was moved by the Earl of Radnor on April 11th, and it was the redoubtable Bishop Copleston himself who moved the customary amendment that it be read a second time that day six months. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Duke

of Wellington followed on the same side, while Lord Holland, Viscount Melbourne, and Lord Brougham expressed their approval of the proposed measure. The amendment was carried without a division, but the Earl of Radnor, Lords Holland, Brougham, Hatherton, Sommerhill and Duncannon entered a protest against the decision of the House.

The noble Earl with astonishing pertinacity renewed his efforts on May 8th, and this time moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into the practice and statutes of the Colleges and Halls in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and to report whether any legislative measure was necessary to enable the governing bodies to make alterations and amendments.¹ Dr. Copleston again took part in the debate. The Duke of Wellington and the Marquis Camden, the Chancellors of the two Universities, having intimated that the greater portion of the Colleges were willing and desirous of entering upon a revision of their statutes through the instrumentality of their Visitors, the Earl of Radnor withdrew his motion.

Nor had this question of University Reform gone unnoticed in the House of Commons. On May 4th, Mr. Pryme,² one of the members for the Borough of Cambridge, moved the House of Commons to address the King to issue a Commission to enquire into the state of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the respective Colleges therein. Mr. Edward Bulwer Lytton seconded the motion. Mr. Spring Rice, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was the other member for the Borough of Cambridge, suggested that the Crown should be left to act on its own sense of public duty without the interposition of the House, and intimated that he should move

¹ This Earl of Radnor seems to have been a remarkable man. Cooper (*Annals*, Vol. IV., p. 607, note) records that as Mr. Bickersteth, and one of the four Senior Fellows of Caius College, he had been a Trustee of the Perse foundation. About 1830 he voluntarily returned to the College nearly £800 which had been paid him out of the Perse fund, but to which he did not consider himself justly entitled.

² Mr. George Pryme, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge, was elected for the Borough of Cambridge along with Mr. Spring Rice in 1832, after the passage of the Reform Bill. He and his colleague were re-elected in 1835.

the previous question if his colleague pressed the motion to a division. After an explanatory speech from Mr. Goulbourn, one of the members for the University of Cambridge, who stated that the Universities themselves would make such regulations as the change of circumstances required, the motion was withdrawn, Mr. Pryme expressing a hope that Ministers would take the necessary steps on their own responsibility.

Turning aside from the field of practical politics, we may now return to Sir William Hamilton and endeavour to determine the precise value of his services to the cause of University Reform. His criticism of Oxford was based on two grounds, the one historical, and the other legal. How far was he right in his history and in his law?

As for the history let us listen to the defence made in reply to Hamilton by Mark Pattison, in his book, "Suggestions on Academical Organisation."¹ Pattison as Rector of Lincoln College, was himself one of the Heads of Houses whom Hamilton had so unsparingly attacked. He writes:—

"Who is in fault for the renunciation by the University of her high vocation (the encouragement of learning as such), and her having taken up with the easier business of schoolkeeping? Not, most assuredly, the University itself. This opinion is almost universal; but it is a historical error. It is, indeed, an error of long standing, but perhaps the articulate enunciation of it was not made before the celebrated attacks on Oxford in the *Edinburgh Review*, and particularly in an article "On the State of the English Universities," in June 1831. At that time, the history, in fact, of Oxford, and the theory of University education, were all but unknown in this country. Sir W. Hamilton, with an antiquarian learning on the subject which is still unequalled, and with a firm grasp of the principles of education, came forward, and in his masterly essays put both the theory and the fact in a clear and striking light. But his righteous indignation at the degeneracy of his own University led him into one great and striking injustice. He argues throughout that the higher courses of the

¹ pp. 127-129.

Professors were discouraged, and finally put down, by the Heads of Colleges, on system, from motives of self-interest, in order to give the monopoly to the Fellow-Tutor. This is certainly not the history of the sinking of the level of instruction in Oxford. The level of learning fell in the Universities because it first fell in the National Church. It fell in both because the sovereign authority used its power over both Church and Universities for political ends. . . . There was an abundance of new life, and a promise of a glorious classical revival in Oxford, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when Corpus and Cardinal (Christ Church) Colleges were founded as homes for the new studies. . . . These prospects of a new life were crushed in the next century, not by any *malfaisance* within, but by the violence of the ecclesiastical revolution without. So far from the death of learning in Oxford having been occasioned by the corrupting influence of over-endowment, it died hard, and yielded up its breath not without many a struggle. The grasp of ecclesiastical tyranny was on its throat; and the twenty-three years of Leicester's Chancellorship (1565-1588) left it pretty much what it remained up to the present century, without independence, without the dignity of knowledge, without intellectual ambition, the mere tool of a political party. . . . It was the Government, and not the University itself, which crushed that academical freedom, without which learning cannot flourish. It was the Government which closed our gates to Nonconformists, and compelled us to forget our proper duty, by occupying us as a spiritual police to maintain an arbitrary *juste milieu* of Church government and doctrine. When Sir W. Hamilton pretends that it was the Board of Heads who in the seventeenth century silenced the Professors, he forgets that, long before the Laudian Statutes of 1636, the Professors had ceased to have a class, because there were no longer any students sufficiently advanced to attend them."¹

¹ The same question is argued from another point of view by the Rev. W. M. Campion in *Cambridge Essays*, 1858, pp. 173-175. "The Tutor" says the writer, "followed the text-book"; in other words it was the printing-press which displaced the Professors.

The historical controversy may be summed up in the following passage from Prof. Goldwin Smith¹:—

“The Colleges in absorbing the University saddled it with their mediæval statutes, with the local and family preferences which founders had thought themselves at liberty to indulge in the selection of literary almsmen, but which were fatal to the fair bestowal of prizes, or the right selection of Tutors; with restrictions on the possession of property suitable only to eleemosynary institutions; with the mediæval rule of celibacy; with clericism, which assumed a new significance when the Clergy, from being a great estate embracing all the intellectual callings, became at the Reformation, in the strict sense, a profession, animated by strong professional feelings, and placed in constant antagonism to Dissent; with a mediæval rule of life and a mediæval rule of study, which growing obsolete, and being inevitably cast aside, notwithstanding the oaths taken to observe them, left nothing but sinecurism in their place. The conjoint operation of celibacy, clericism and sinecurism reduced the educational staff of the Colleges (which, the Professoriate having fallen into total decay, was also that of the University) to a few clergymen waiting in College for College livings, and filling up the interval by a perfunctory discharge of the duties for which they received Tutors’ fees. All studies but those connected with the clerical profession, or adopted by the Clergy—that is to say the learned languages and divinity—fell into decay. The Faculties of Law and Medicine dwindled to shadows, the substance departing to the Inns of Court and the London Hospitals. Even the Faculty of Theology itself, the Anglican Church having developed no scientific theology to replace that of the Middle Ages, became almost a name.

“The connection between Church and State cut us off from the Nonconformists, a growing element in the nation; and in addition to this, clericism bound us to the political party to which the Clergy were allied, and which, at the same time, as the party opposed to change, was most congenial to the holders of large sinecure endowments.

¹ *Reorganisation*, p 6.

“It was mainly the exclusively clerical character of the University that shut the door against Science. At Cambridge, through a combination of historical accidents,¹ the clerical spirit was less strong, and a turn had been given to study, at a critical moment, by Newton.”

Hamilton, then, is admitted to be right in the main as to his facts, though in his explanations as to the causes of some of these facts, he is open to correction. His statement of the legal position has never been refuted. Dean Peacock, in his “Observations on the Statutes” thus describes what happened.² “The process of change, by which we have passed from the conditions of manners, opinions, and knowledge, which the ancient Statutes contemplated, to those which prevail in modern times, has been so gradual, as to be nearly insensible to contemporary observation, and to present no point or period of transition sufficiently marked and considerable to call the attention of those who were subjected to their enactments very suddenly or forcibly to the great separation which time had effected between the written law and practice of the University. It will be found, however, that those provisions of the Statutes which affected the personal rights of members of the same society, were generally enforced by the vigilant observation of those who had a direct or indirect interest in the penalties attached to their violation, whilst the most solemn injunctions which were addressed to their consciences merely, and not to their personal interests or fears, have been in many cases either entirely disregarded, or their observation has been disguised under some unmeaning form and ceremony, which satisfied the letter, whilst it totally violated the spirit of the law. . . . The substantial fact remains established of the great separation which exists between the written and obligatory law and the actual practice of the University.”

Though Hamilton was right in his legal criticism, he made it in an exaggerated and offensive form. The

¹ The story of some of these “historical accidents” has been told in the Introductory Chapter. Incidentally they explain why Cambridge has always been somewhat more liberal than Oxford.

² pp. 59-61, 73.

charges of illegality, usurpation and perjury, especially the last, are made with wearisome reiteration. The lapse of time, as Peacock so clearly explains, had made much of the statute law obsolete both in the Universities and Colleges, and therefore impossible of fulfilment, and the oaths so to do equally impossible. It was a wrong state of things and its abolition was unduly delayed, but perjury is an offence against the law punishable with seven years penal servitude, and to lay it to the charge of men who had erred partly through ignorance and partly through indolence repels the reader.

Sir Leslie Stephen in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, says, "Hamilton's tone in controversy was anything but conciliatory and certainly not free from pedantry, but his aim was always high, and he stirred some important questions." The criticism is just but the praise is decidedly grudging. We may set against it a sentence from Abbott and Campbell's *Life of Jowett*—"The first beginnings of the movement for reform at Oxford may be traced to Sir William Hamilton's articles in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1831-1834."¹ Even in controversy Hamilton was able on occasion to show himself both moderate and reasonable. The opening paragraphs of the most important of all his articles, that "On the state of the English Universities," contain these words: "We have no hesitation in affirming, that comparing what it actually is with what it possibly could be, Oxford is, of all academical institutions, at once the most imperfect and the most perfectible." Further on he writes, "That there is much of good, much worthy of imitation by other Universities, in the present spirit and the present economy of Oxford, we are happy to acknowledge. . . . We are no enemies of Collegial residence, no enemies of Tutorial discipline. . . . A Tutorial system in subordination to a Professorial (which Oxford formerly enjoyed) we regard as affording *the condition of an absolutely perfect University*." At the end of the article there are further words of conciliation. "The strictures, which a conviction of their truth, and our interest in the honour and utility of this venerable school, have constrained us to make on the conduct of the

¹ Vol. I., p. 172.

Hebdomadal Meeting, we mainly apply to the Heads of Houses of a former generation, and even to them solely in their corporate capacity. Of the late and present members of this body, we are happy to acknowledge, that, during the last twenty-five years, so great an improvement has been effected through their influence, that in some essential points Oxford may, not unworthily, be proposed as a pattern to most other Universities. But this improvement, though important, is partial, and can only receive its adequate development by a return to the *statutory combination of the Professorial and Tutorial systems.*"

As Hamilton grew older, his tone grew still milder. His Appendix on the Reform of the English Universities, to which the finishing touches were put in 1853, reads very differently from the *Edinburgh Review* article of 1831. The quotations already given from it prove this to be the fact, and there are passages which may be cited in confirmation. Hamilton saw clearly that the Collegiate system must be maintained. "Were the institutions of domestic superintendence and Tutorial instruction even in themselves defective, I should be unwilling to supersede them; for the simple reason that they are already established, and consuetudinary."¹

"We are social animals," he exclaims. "He, therefore, often studies better, who does not study alone. It is in conforming to this requisite of our human nature, that those Universities which compel their alumni to live in common, can best vindicate the utility of academical Houses; for in the community of a college life the social conditions of study are most fully and certainly supplied."² Hamilton's own plan of combining the University and the Colleges, the Professorial and the Tutorial systems, is only sketched in outline in the Appendix; but so far as one can judge, where so much is left for the reader to fill in, it is extremely moderate, being practically the Scottish system modified by the College Tutors acting as Assistant Professors, with the advantage on the side of the older Universities because of the much larger number of subsidiary teachers who would be available.

¹ *Discussions*, p. 759.

² *Ib.* p. 779.

Hamilton by means of his historical researches gained a clear view of Oxford University as a whole, and of the Collegiate system as a whole. The University stood before his mind as a unity which had of old the power of self-government and self-improvement, and he was convinced that to become an institution at once national and worthy of the nation, Oxford must again become such a unity. In his first article he does not expend himself on detailed suggestions, but deals with first principles and fundamental facts. In his Appendix he makes detailed suggestions, but his aim is always "to raise the University to its ancient supremacy above the Colleges—or rather to raise the Colleges to their proper level."¹

In this grasp of general principles lies, I think, the secret of the influence which he has undoubtedly exercised over those who have come after him. Newman, Lyell, Whewell, Donaldson, Bonamy Price, Goldwin Smith, Mark Pattison, Lord Curzon, all quote him or are influenced by him. The Cambridge University Commission Report mentions him by name. The Oxford Report gives silent testimony to him. Page after page of it, as Lord Curzon points out, shows the anxiety of the Commissioners for the right adjustment of the relations between the University and the Colleges, to the need for which Hamilton is admittedly the first to have called attention. Such adjustment is a far-reaching principle, not a mere correction of abuses, nor an improvement in details. When the Universities are remodelled in accordance with this principle, as assuredly they some day will be, Sir William Hamilton will come into his own, and be recognised as the Father of University Reform, Sir Leslie Stephen and the *Dictionary of National Biography* notwithstanding.

One curious fact may be called attention to in concluding this chapter. Hamilton has the following scornful Note on p. 792 of his Appendix:—"The Rev. Mr. Sewell, Tutor of New College, and otherwise an able man, has of late gravely proposed,—to send out to the great towns of England tutorial missions, from the bodies thus so

brightly illuminating Oxford; professedly, in order, that any change may be averted from the system of education which has wrought so admirably in that University, and, at the same time, to communicate the benefit of such system to the lieges at large!" The Rev. Mr. Sewell may have acted from mixed motives, but if this account is correct, he must be credited with having first foreseen the possibility of the University Extension Movement. This movement, which began at Cambridge, has been entered into with extraordinary success by the sister University. It is no part of this book to treat of any reform outside the Universities, but those who are interested in the subject may profitably consult what Lord Curzon says about it in his *Principles and Methods of University Reform*.¹

¹ See pp. 54-56.

CHAPTER IV.

UNIVERSITY *v.* COLLEGES (CAMBRIDGE).

As Cardinal Newman furnished an introduction for the second chapter, so may he furnish one for our fourth. In his "Rise and Progress of Universities,"¹ which forms the first part of his third volume of "Historical Sketches," near the beginning of the XVth Chapter, he again refers to the controversy begun by the *Edinburgh Review* as "the dispute which has been carried on at intervals in the British Universities for the last fifty years." He continues, "It began in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*, which at that time might in some sense be called the organ of the University of Edinburgh. Twenty years later, if my memory does not play me false, it was renewed in the same quarter; then it was taken up at Cambridge, and lately it was going on briskly between some of the most able members of the University of Oxford. Now what has been the point of dispute between the combatants? This,—whether a University should be conducted on the system of Professors, or on the system of Colleges and College Tutors. . . . The party of the North and of progress have ever advocated the Professorial system, as it has been called, and have pointed in their own behalf to the practice of the middle ages and of modern Germany and France; the party of the South and of prescription have ever stood up for the Tutorial or Collegiate system, and have pointed to Protestant Oxford and Cambridge, where it has almost or altogether superseded the Professorial." Two remarks may be made on this extract. The first is that the controversy here referred to was not at bottom a difference of opinion about two rival methods of teaching; what was really in the minds of the disputants was whether the University should be restored to its old supremacy, or whether the

¹ This consists of a series of articles contributed to the *Catholic University Gazette* in 1854, and then published in 1856 under the title of *Office and Work of Universities*. In 1872 it was republished under the title given in the text.

Colleges should retain the domination which they had in fact, if not in name, won over the University. When Newman heads his XVth Lecture, "Professors and Tutors," the title is really equivalent to that of "University v. Colleges," which is prefixed to the present chapter. The second remark is that Sir William Hamilton, though he was the foremost fighter for the ancient status of the University, as has been made abundantly clear, yet insisted that the Collegiate system must be retained, the worst Colleges being brought up, if possible, to the level of the best.

The dispute, says Newman, was taken up at Cambridge. The way in which this took place was roundabout and curious. In 1845 Sir Charles Lyell (at that time plain Mr. Lyell) published a book entitled "*Travels in North America*." It consisted almost entirely of geological observations on that country, but in chapter xiii. the author describes how he went to the Annual Meeting of American Geologists at Boston. During his stay in that city he was bombarded with questions as to the constitution of the English Universities. These questions he found it very difficult to answer. "The more," he says, "I endeavoured to explain the present state of our academical course of study, and the peculiar organisation of the corps of teachers to whom its superintendence is confided, the more strange it appeared to my New England friends; and I myself became the more aware of its distinctive and anomalous character, when contrasted with the methods followed elsewhere." He continues, "Many who have been educated, like myself, at Oxford, are ignorant of the system of education formerly acted upon in our English Universities, and of the real nature and causes of the present state of things. I shall, therefore, attempt to give, in the remainder of this chapter, a brief account of the leading peculiarities of our former and present academical machinery, and to point out its inevitable consequence, the very limited range of studies which can be pursued, so long as things remain unaltered."¹ Lyell gives the following description of the College system: "In the first place, then, the mass of

¹ *Travels in North America*, Vol. I., p. 271.

students or undergraduates at Oxford is divided into twenty-four separate communities or Colleges, very unequal in numbers, the residents in each varying from 10 in the smaller to about 140 in the larger Colleges, and the whole business of educating these separate sections of the youth is restricted to the Tutors of the separate Colleges. Consequently, two or three individuals, and occasionally a single instructor, may be called upon to give lectures in all the departments of human knowledge embraced in the academical course of four years. If the College be small, there is only occupation and salary sufficient to support one Tutor; any attempt, therefore, to sub-divide the different branches of learning and sciences among distinct teachers is abandoned. . . In a few of the larger Colleges, indeed, some rude approach to such a partition is made, so far as to sever the mathematical from the classical studies; but even then the Tutors in each division are often called upon, in the public examinations, to play their part in both departments. Thus, a single instructor gives lectures or examines in the writings of the Greek and Roman historians, philosophers, and poets, together with logic, the elements of mathematics and theology. . . In the next place, I may state, that the choice of teachers is by no means left open to free competition, like the Professorships in most ancient and modern Universities. The College Tutors are selected from graduates who are on the foundation of their respective Colleges, and who may have obtained their appointment originally, some because they happened to be the founder's kin, or were educated at a particular school, others because they were born in a particular town, county or diocese; a few only being selected for merit, or as having distinguished themselves in examinations open to all candidates. Most of these teachers forfeit their Fellowship, and most probably with it their office of Tutor, if they should marry, or if, after a certain number of years, they do not embrace the clerical profession. They also look to preferment in the Church from their position in their College, so that they have every inducement to regard the business of teaching as a temporary calling. Their office as instructors is, in short, a mere stepping-stone to something else; and they hope

to gain their reward, not when they are superannuated, but when they are still in the prime of life. In fact, their promotion is so contrived as at once to cut short the career of usefulness in which they may have hitherto distinguished themselves.”¹

Lyell then goes into a disquisition as to the origin of these evils. In this he follows Sir William Hamilton (to whose article of June 1831 he refers in a footnote on p. 278), but he gives his own account of the struggle over the Examination Statute at Oxford in 1800 (in which he naturally objects to the exclusion of the Natural Sciences) and the events which followed after. He refers to Dr. Peacock's book on the Statutes of the University of Cambridge (p. 156) for an account of similar developments at Cambridge. Lyell is especially interesting in what he says about the events of the year 1839. “In the year 1839,” he writes, “a last and most vigorous attempt was made at Oxford to restore the functions of the professorial body, which had now become contracted within the narrowest limits.² The Professors of Experimental Philosophy, Comparative Anatomy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany, Geometry and Astronomy, sent in a representation to the Heads of Houses, in which they declared their inability to discharge the duties which they had undertaken, notwithstanding their unabated zeal and devotion. They accompanied their petition with a printed statistical table, showing how the number of their classes had fallen off. It appeared that the Anatomy class had dwindled between the years 1819 and 1838 to less than half, and that of Astronomy to one-fifth of its original numbers. The same had happened to the class of Chemistry, many others having declined in like ratio. A majority of the Heads of Houses were favourable to a reform, and consequently proposed a new examination

¹ *Ib.* pp. 272-274.

² A similar attempt was made at Cambridge in 1843, when a Syndicate was appointed “to consider whether it is desirable to take any measures, and if so what, to secure a correspondence between the Mathematical and Classical Examinations of the University, and the Mathematical and Classical Lectures of the University Professors.” The Syndicate having made a report, a Grace to carry its recommendations into effect was proposed on March 31st and rejected in the Non-Regent House by 27 non-placets to 14 placets. (Cooper, *Annals*, IV., pp. 659-660.)

statute, in which there was a provision requiring attendance on at least *two* series of professorial lectures, as a preliminary qualification for the Bachelor of Arts' Degree. . . . But it was now too late—reform was beyond the power of the Hebdomadal Board. Several academical generations had grown up under the new order of things.¹ The Collegiate and private Tutors were interested in opposing the new provisions, and they were accordingly rejected in Convocation. Yet while they threw out that part of the proposed Statute which would have gone far towards reviving the Professorial Chairs, they passed another part requiring the Professors of Astronomy, Experimental Philosophy, Chemistry, Geology, Mineralogy, Anatomy, Botany, Medicine, Civil Law, English Law, Greek, Arabic, Sanscrit, Anglo - Saxon, Poetry, Modern History, and Political Economy, to deliver regular courses of lectures. They were, in fact, bound not only by ancient statutes to require the teachers above enumerated faithfully to discharge their duty, but since the Examination Statute of 1800, they had sanctioned the foundation of new Chairs, such as Experimental Philosophy, Mineralogy, Geology, Political Economy, and Sanscrit, and had accepted annual grants from the Crown to endow certain Readerships. In homage, therefore, to the moral obligations they had incurred not to render these new and old foundations nugatory, they continued to exact an outward conformity to the Statutes, by enforcing the delivery of lectures, the efficiency of which they allowed other parts of their system to defeat. Their conduct reminds us of the orders issued by Charles the Fifth to offer up prayers throughout Spain for the deliverance of the Pope while he suffered his army to retain him prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo.”²

The results of this policy are thus depicted. “After the year 1839, we may consider three-fourths of the Sciences, still nominally taught at Oxford, to have been virtually exiled from the University. The class-rooms of the

¹ *i.e.* that which resulted from the passing of the first Examination Statute in 1810. There were no examinations and no resulting degrees in Science, and therefore the undergraduates would not attend lectures which from the standpoint of a degree were of no use to them. No Fellowships either were awarded for Science at this time.

² *Travels in North America*, pp. 291-294.

Professors were some of them entirely, others nearly, deserted. Chemistry and Botany attracted between the years 1840 and 1844, from three to seven students; Geometry, Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy scarcely more; Mineralogy and Geology, still taught by the same Professor, who, fifteen years before, had attracted crowded audiences, from ten to twelve; Political Economy still fewer; even Ancient History and Poetry scarcely commanded an audience; and strange to say, in a country with whose destinies those of India are so closely bound up, the first of Asiatic scholars gave lectures to one or two pupils, and these might have been absent, had not the cherished hope of a Boden scholarship induced them to attend.”¹

Sir Charles Lyell, having drawn this graphic picture of his own University, next turns to Cambridge. “At Cambridge,” he writes,² “the Collegiate influence has, since the Reformation, caused the University to pass gradually through nearly all the same phases as at Oxford. . . Very recently at Cambridge, all branches of knowledge taught by the Professors—in a word, every subject except what is understood in our Universities by Classics and Mathematics—have had sentence of banishment passed upon them in the form of new compulsory examinations, under the management of College Tutors, the Oxford plan of awarding honours in classical and mathematical attainments alone being adhered to. The Professors of Chemistry and Anatomy, who had formerly considerable classes, have only mustered six or seven pupils, although still compelled to give courses of fifty lectures each. The Chairs of Modern History, and of the application of Machinery to the Arts, once numbering audiences of several hundreds, have been in like manner deserted. Yet dispensations are rarely granted for the discontinuance of useless duties, even when only two pupils present themselves.

“Moreover, here, as at Oxford, it is not uncommon to give such Chairs as Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Botany, Astronomy, Geology, Mineralogy and others to clergymen, who combine them with clerical

¹ *Ib.* pp. 298-9.

² *Ib.* p. 38.

duties, or throw them up when they obtain preferment, and who, however eminent, owing, as they must do, a mixed allegiance, partly to their ecclesiastical order, and partly to the professorial body, cannot stand up with heart and courage in defence of the public, as opposed to the clerical and collegiate interests.¹ . . . The panegyrists, indeed, of the modern University system in England, seem never to admit candidly this plain truth, that the Colleges have no alternative in regard to the course of study open to them. Take any flourishing University in Great Britain or on the Continent, where a wide range of studies are taught. Let the students be divided into fifteen or more sections, without any classification in reference to their age, acquirements, talents, tastes, or future prospects. Assign to each section a separate set of teachers, chiefly clerical, and looking forward to preferment in the Church and public schools, and from these select all your public examiners. What must be the result? The immediate abandonment of three-fourths of the sciences now taught, while those retained will belong of necessity to the less progressive branches of human knowledge."²

As for a remedy Lyell says, "Appeal under such circumstances must therefore be made to an external authority. A Royal Commission like those which have more than once visited of late years the Universities of Scotland, might prove a sufficient counterpoise to the power and *vis inertiae* of forty learned Corporations."³

Lyell also took occasion to criticise Whewell for his views on the proper subjects of College and professorial teaching. Whewell had written, "The subjects suitable for University teaching are the undoubted truths of mathematics, and works of unquestioned excellence, such as the best classical authors. When engaged in these, the student *respects* his instructor; they are the fit subjects of *College* lectures. A spirit of criticism is awakened by the study of philosophy, which is a fit subject of *professorial* lectures."⁴ Whewell had also written,⁵ "Professorial lectures are especially suited to those which we have called

¹ *Ib.* pp. 302-3.² *Ib.* pp. 307-8.³ *Ib.* p. 311.⁴ *University Education*, pp. 46-53.⁵ *Liberal Education*, p. 112.

Progressive studies. . . But with regard to Permanent studies, the impression which, in a Liberal Education, they ought to produce upon the mind, is eminently promoted by College Lectures such as we have described; and can, by no means, be derived from Professorial Lectures alone." Progressive and Permanent studies had been defined by Whewell at p. 5 of the same work. Permanent studies were "those portions of knowledge which have long taken their permanent shape; ancient languages with their literature and long-established demonstrated sciences,"—i.e. Classics and Mathematics. To the Progressive Studies "belong the results of the mental activity of our own times; the literature of our own age, and the sciences in which men are making progress from day to day,"—i.e. Philosophy and Natural Science. These two systems of education may "with nearly equal propriety" be treated "as *practical* and *speculative* teaching; or on the one hand *mathematics* combined with *classics*; and on the other philosophy;—or *College* lectures, and professorial lectures;—and we may look upon them as exemplifying a *respectful* and a *critical* spirit."¹

Whewell flings aside Lyell's historical criticisms with something like contempt. He writes,² "Mr. Lyell seems to make it one of his objections to the existing system of the English Universities that it is of modern origin. He appears to hold, with a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, that the ancient system of the Universities was one in which Professorial Lectures were the main instrument of teaching. . . But I suppose Mr. Lyell would not himself attach much weight to this argument of his, from the asserted practice of a remote antiquity. The College system has, as he allows, prevailed in the English Universities from the time of the Reformation, which is surely antiquity enough, if antiquity is to guide us. The defenders of the College system have never, so far as I am aware, rested its defence mainly upon its remote antiquity. They have spoken of its advantages. . . If we can secure these advantages, we shall not readily consent to part with them in order to go back to the condition which he represents as existing before the Reformation.

¹ *University Education*, pp. 52-53.

² *Liberal Education*, pp. 127-131.

A return to an obsolete state of things on the ground of antiquity is generally a mischievous innovation." Whewell does indeed make an admission about private tuition. "I have no wish," he writes, "to deny either the existence, or the importance of this evil. . . . But I see no reason whatever to believe that Mr. Lyell's remedies would avail us."

Whewell was also altogether opposed to the appointment of a Royal Commission as suggested by Lyell. "Such an interference from without, with the legislation of the Universities, would, I am fully persuaded, be productive of immense harm. It might destroy all the advantages of the existing system; but that anything so thrust into the structure of these ancient institutions would assimilate with their organisation, or work to any good purpose, I see no reason to hope. Such a measure could hardly be attempted without producing a sentiment of wrong in the majority of the existing members of the University, which would deprive the new scheme of all co-operation on their part."¹ Whewell believed in "reform from within," but in five years from the publication of the above remarks the dreaded Royal Commission was appointed.

An echo of this controversy between University and Colleges, Professors and Tutors, is to be found in a Cambridge pamphlet entitled "The Next Step."² At p. 40 the writer says, "One great difficulty in this question (an improved system of Examinations) is that of reconciling the College and University systems, or of forming a general system, where much must be left to the Colleges singly, and cannot be brought under one management. If we legislate too minutely, we run the risk of putting the University in the place of the Colleges, an alteration, which, even if desirable, would stand no chance of being carried. Our object must be to procure a comprehensive system, which shall secure as much as possible uniformity in its working without meddling too much with details. To carry out any such plan to the full extent, a cordial co-operation of the Colleges with the University is necessary, but it is greatly to be feared that such a co-operation is far from likely."

¹ *Ib.* p. 127.

² Attributed by Mr. J. W. Clark to A. R. Grant.

Another echo may be found in a pamphlet, "Observations on the Cambridge system," by A. H. Wratislaw.¹ "In the first place," writes Mr. Wratislaw, "the College system is most singularly adapted for getting rid of the best men at the very age when they begin to be most useful. Extreme youth is the peculiar characteristic of the College Lecturer. And most of such Lecturers, when possessed of ability, soon betake themselves to situations where they are better paid and can look to obtaining a permanent settlement. In the large Colleges it is true there is pecuniary inducement, in the one case for three, in the other for two Tutors to remain for a considerable period: and perhaps most of the small Colleges can offer a tolerable pecuniary recompense to a single Tutor. But the Tutors of small Colleges, if there be more than one, and the Lecturers of all Colleges, both large and small, have no inducement whatever to continue their exertions, beyond the mere fact of not having yet provided themselves with satisfactory permanent situations in other quarters. Thus the Public Schools and other institutions have the pick of our best men. . . . It is futile to talk of Professorial Education entering into the Cambridge system, when almost every subject of Professorial Lectures is unanimously ignored by the Colleges, and it is mere waste of time for a student wishing to obtain a Fellowship to pay the slightest attention to them. Nay, if all the Professors were swept away to-morrow, their absence (except so far as the personal influence of individuals is concerned) would be scarcely perceptible in the University. Where any symptom of the Professorial system is found, every development of the principle of competition, so unsparingly applied to the students, is sedulously suppressed and exterminated. With almost the only exception of the quasi-professorial Lectures delivered at Trinity on Plato and Aristotle to the second and third years, I have no hesitation in asserting the average run of College Lectures to be rarely above and generally far below, the level of the lessons of the head class in a well-conducted Public School, depressed as such Lectures necessarily are, owing to the mixed classes

¹ Published in 1848 partly in reply to, and partly suggested by Whewell's *Liberal Education*.

of ignoramuses and proficients lectured together under the College system. . . The fact is that our Professorial Staff is a mere hodge-podge of independent and sometimes capricious foundations, and has really no claim whatever upon the position it ought to assume, I mean that of a body directing and superintending the higher education and studies of the University. These are evils which the University cannot remedy by any revision or reformation of her Statutes. She has no control whatever over the individual Colleges. If any College were to stop lectures entirely to-morrow, close its Chapel, or perform any other antic, the University would have no power of interfering. These evils arise from the relations between the Colleges and the University, and can be remedied only by *the compulsory application of a portion of the revenues of the separate Colleges, at present wasted upon non-residents, to the higher purposes of the University.* They can therefore only be remedied by the State and the two Houses of Parliament. Under these circumstances, and until such State interference takes place, it only remains for every individual engaged in the Public Tuition of the Colleges to do his utmost to alleviate the evils, which he may lament, but cannot cure."

The same writer returned to the subject in 1850. In a pamphlet, "Observations on the Cambridge System," he says (p. 8), "The College system is utterly insufficient for the higher parts of Education in every branch of learning. . . I dare almost assert that the University would gladly reform itself, but is enslaved and imprisoned by the Colleges, which at once monopolise and oppress her. It is perhaps not generally known that no College contributes a single farthing towards the *Education* of the students, the Fellowships being either absolutely or practically pure sinecures, and the Tutors and Lecturers deriving their whole revenues, as such, from the pockets of the undergraduates. . . Is there no call for reform here? Is there no necessity for State interference to secure a fitting portion of the College revenues to their use as Educational Establishments, or to that of the University? . . . Nor is it generally known that while the Colleges are keeping the University in their

hands, or rather in their fetters, they do not contribute a single farthing towards its expenses; that while they are sending thousands of pounds annually to non-residents, who are doing nothing for their money, the University is penniless and almost bankrupt. . . . There is no necessity in the nature of things for the continuance of the present system, which the Dean of Ely¹ has shewn to have been forcibly instituted by the Elizabethan Statutes, and to have caused a complete revolution in the constitution of the University. The Colleges were never intended to monopolise the University. . . . What, then, is it that we want in the University? In the first place, freedom; freedom from the narrow thralldom of the College system. In the second place, the application of the College revenues to their original purposes, though not perhaps always in the manner and form originally devised by the Founders. And in the third place, inducements to the learned and scientific to remain and reside and pursue their studies amongst us.² . . . There is a Syndicate sitting for the revision of the Statutes of the University. Its grand difficulty is the relation between the University and the Colleges. Everybody knows how rarely and how unwillingly a Corporation reforms itself; but here we have Corporations within a Corporation, the lesser Corporations individually irresponsible to, and collectively monopolising the larger one. Over the Colleges the University is powerless: what can we expect here except from State interference to facilitate the progress of reform?³ . . . The fact is, that the College system is not capable of further extension, and if other branches of learning besides Latin, Greek and Mathematics are to be pursued here, extensive organic changes must open the way for an extended University system, of which the Colleges in their several spheres may form a most useful and beneficial portion.⁴ . . . Surely far more individuals than at present might enjoy the advantages of society and education at the Universities. But that they do not is entirely owing to the expensive, unpractical and narrow nature of the corrupt and exclusive College system.”⁵

¹ Dr. Peacock.

² pp. 9-10.

³ p. 13.

⁴ p. 15.

⁵ p. 17.

Finally Dr. Donaldson's contribution to the subject may be noted. It is contained in the first part of his "Classical Scholarship and Classical Learning," which was published in 1856, after the Royal Commission had reported but before Parliament had actually legislated. Into the historical survey therein contained it is not necessary to enter. The author comes to the point now under discussion at p. 32. "The *fact* that the system of education is too narrow both at Oxford and Cambridge . . . is alleged by all who have written on the subject of University reform, and is known to be slightly, if at all, qualified by the institution of new triposes.¹ And the *cause* is as confidently and unanimously alleged to be the College system, or immediately, that substitution of competitive tests for University teaching which is referred to the influence of the Colleges. The case as far as Oxford is concerned, has been stated repeatedly and with great ability by Sir William Hamilton." He then quotes Mr. Wratislaw's pamphlet, "Observations on the Cambridge System," and also the author of the "Next Step," with regard to his own University.

He continues²: "For my own part, I am bound to express my conviction that, so far as education is cramped and narrowed and degraded at Cambridge in particular, the cause is to be sought in the subordination of the University to the Colleges, and in the admission to the latter of a great number of students who are not duly qualified for University teaching, and that the first and main remedy would be a genuine University matriculation. At the same time, I think that the case with regard to the Colleges has not always been fully understood and fairly represented, and that the important functions, which they will perform even when the University is restored to its proper independence and authority, are not duly appreciated, but frequently undervalued."

Dr. Donaldson then gives his own historical review, and after praising the Colleges, especially Trinity and St. John's, for the way in which they discharge their duties,

¹ The Moral Sciences Tripos, and the Natural Sciences Tripos, the first lists of which appeared in 1851.

² p. 35.

elaborates his position thus¹: — “But the very fact that the best Colleges are the largest, and the smallest generally the worst, seems to furnish an argument in favour of the opinion, that the desired object would be obtained, if the University were, what its name denotes and what it once was, one community and not a number of different communities. At any rate, there is no doubt in the minds of those who have studied the subject, that, in spite of their various merits and the importance of their endowments, the Colleges interpose the greatest obstacles to the free play of our academical agency. While they do not spend any part of their revenues on the education of the undergraduates, they oblige all undergraduates to pay for such education as they furnish by becoming members of some College, and, by virtue of the revolution forced upon the University by the Elizabethan Statutes, usurp the rights belonging to the University as such. . . . But it is not only by obliging all members of the University to be members of Colleges also, and then compelling them to attend and pay for a sort of school-boy lessons, that the College system cramps and trammels the University teaching. The Colleges are also responsible for the admission and matriculation of a very large proportion of members quite disqualified by their existing knowledge from any intelligent participation in a course of genuine academic teaching. That this should be a natural result of the limitation of the University to the Colleges and their members must appear to any one who reflects. The Colleges are really a collection of rival boarding schools. The interest and credit of each of them make it desirable that they should have the largest possible number of entries. Can it be surprising then that they should be unwilling to reject any candidate for admission, who comes to them with a plausible recommendation?”

Opportunity will be taken hereafter to show what measure of truth there still is in these accusations.

¹ *Ib.* p. 41.

CHAPTER V

UNIVERSITY *v.* COLLEGES (OXFORD).

At Oxford the discussion of the above topic showed a tendency to wander into a by-path, and to become a controversy between the Professorial lecture and the Tutorial or catechetical class, the living voice and the printed book. This result was probably due to the impulse which Copleston gave it in the first instance. After the description of the Examinations quoted above in Chapter II., he continues as follows¹:—

“It will be evident, from the statement here given, that the students are prepared to pass this examination, not by solemn public lectures, delivered to a numerous class from a Professor’s chair, but by private study in their respective Colleges. This method of study is the next thing which requires to be explained; for upon this point also the world are greatly, and in some instances purposely, misinformed.

“The mode of instruction by College Lectures, which prevails at both the English Universities, is an innovation on the original plan, which formerly obtained among them, and which is still practised in foreign Universities, and I believe in those of Scotland. Some peculiar advantages there are attending each method, and the best method perhaps would be that which should unite both more completely than is the case with any modern University. If, however, they are compared one against the other, as means of instruction, the preference seems strongly due to that of College Lectures.

“Under this system the pupils of one Tutor are easily classed according to their capacities, and the stock of learning and science they bring with them. When formed into these sub-divisions, the choice of the lecture may be adapted to their peculiar wants, and the lecturer can perceive, individually as he goes along, how his instruction is received. The heaviness of solitary reading is

¹ *Reply*, pp. 145, 146.

relieved by the number which compose a class: this number varies from three or four to ten or twelve: a sort of emulation is awakened in the pupil, and a degree of animation in the instructor, which cannot take place with a single pupil, and which approaches to the vivacity of a public speaker addressing an audience. At the same time he can address himself to individuals, satisfy their scruples, correct their errors, and in so doing, the subject being thoroughly sifted and handled is seen in a variety of lights, and fastens more durably on the mind of those who are listeners merely. Indeed, the impression thus made by theorems of science, and by processes of reasoning on every subject, is so much more vivid, and the means are at hand of ascertaining so satisfactorily how each pupil receives what he hears, that the business of teaching is made less irksome and fatiguing to both parties; and in a few weeks the Tutor is enabled to form a juster estimate of the abilities, and quickness, and mental habits of his pupil, than any other system could explain to him in as many years."

Hamilton naturally took the opposite view to Copleston, whom he disliked and whose name he never succeeded in spelling correctly. In his article "On the Patronage and Superintendence of Universities"¹ he lays it down that "*Universities are establishments founded and privileged by the State for public purposes: they accomplish these purposes through their Professors.*"² In a note on the same page he adds, "Oxford and Cambridge are no exceptions. Inasmuch as they now accomplish nothing through their Professors, they are no longer *Universities*; and this even by their own Statutes."

As we have seen, Hamilton modified his views in later years, and in his Appendix he uses his milder tone. He there writes,³ "There are two kinds of Instructors . . . *Professors and Tutors.* . . Tutors are now, *de facto*, at least, the only necessary instructors in Oxford and Cambridge; Professors alone are known in the other British, as in all foreign, Universities. Instruction by Tutors, and instruction by Professors, have, severally, peculiar advantages."

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, Vol. LIX., No. cxix., pp. 196-227 (April, 1834).

² *Discussions*, p. 363.

³ pp. 802-812.

The Oxford controversy alluded to by Newman arose out of the evidence given before the Royal Commission of 1850 by Professor H. Halford Vaughan. Dr. Pusey, who had himself refused to give evidence before the Commissioners, regarding them as an unlawful body, attacked Vaughan for the views he had expressed. The Professor, in his pamphlet entitled *Oxford Reform and Oxford Professors*,¹ summarising this attack, declared that Pusey had maintained that the endowment of Professors and their erection into importance was unadvisable for five reasons, because

First, Professorial lectures do not communicate knowledge well;

Secondly, Professorial lectures do not give a discipline to the faculties; and so on.

Pusey replied in a lengthy pamphlet entitled *Collegiate and Professorial Teaching and Discipline*, in which he argued, on Copleston's lines, for the superiority of catechetical class teaching over Professorial discourses. He also defended the College system chiefly from Continental examples. It is easy to understand why the dispute took this turn. If College teaching methods could be shown to be better than Professorial teaching methods, the College system as a whole clearly showed to advantage in this particular respect when contrasted with the University system, and its upholders felt that they had scored a point.² Pusey had also a theological reason for the attitude he took up. The German system was Professorial, and from Germany came Rationalism and heterodox views about the Bible. Pusey feared for the faith if the Professorial system was again exalted to power at Oxford, but this second by-path would lead us still further away from the main course of the history of University reform.

A contribution of more enduring value, going back to the broader lines, was made at Oxford by Professor Bonamy Price. In this case we have the advantage of

¹ Vaughan has a very eloquent passage on the advantages of oral teaching, which is quoted by Newman (*Historical Sketches*, Vol. III., pp. 186-187), with a characteristic comment, and also by Donaldson (*Classical Studies*, pp. 62-63).

² A Cambridge contribution to this side issue may be found in Campion, *Cambridge Essays*, 1858, pp. 169-173, and 175-176.

comparing the views of the writer in 1850, when he had no thought of ever rising to University distinction, with his views in 1875, when he was seated in the Professorial chair.

The first expression of these views is in a pamphlet published in 1850, entitled *Suggestions for the Extension of Professorial Teaching in the University of Oxford*.¹ After enumerating the various causes which lead men to desire University Reform, such as the infusion of a larger amount of science and literature into the curriculum, the waste of splendid endowments, the heavy expense of a University education, or the defective systems of University and College government, the writer comes to the conclusion that "The practical conversion of the Universities into Public Schools, involving as it does such serious consequences to the pupils, the teachers and the country at large, is, I conceive, the strongest reason which calls for University Reform."

The functions of the Universities are double—to promote learning, and to educate the young. The latter office is in many respects admirably discharged. Its efficiency dates from this century (1800.) But this very efficiency has caused the other duty, that of advancing learning, to be neglected. The Colleges vie with one another in their efforts to secure the greatest number of First-Class men or high Wranglers. Hence an evil of immense magnitude—the excess of educational labour imposed on the Tutors. An active Tutor has no leisure for reading and self-improvement. Nor would it be any advantage to him if he had. If he acquired new stores of learning, his pupils would reject them because they would not find them of any use in the Schools, *i.e.* for examination purposes.

One obvious method of alleviating this evil would be to give a wider range to the Examinations. But this would be impossible with the existing College system. So many separate bodies could not be induced to act together, and a single College would be powerless. The existing system is bad for the Tutors, because they know the road to literary or scientific distinction is barred by it. The nation is also the poorer through it. Thus the

¹ It was just after the announcement of the Royal Commission had been made.

best men leave the Universities for a career elsewhere. "The evil has gone on increasing of late years. The complaint is very general at both Universities that the Tutors are much younger men than they were formerly; and that literary eminence is becoming rarer among them.

"It will be said, perhaps, that the Tutors are not the whole University; that there are Heads of Houses, Professors, and other residents from whom great eminence may be expected. . . The various modes of electing Heads furnish no guarantee for profound learning. They are engaged with the discipline and government of the University; they take no part in the business of education." As for the Professors, "it is remarkable that no class of residents at Oxford has demanded University Reform with so much earnestness. They have proclaimed the fact that they are outside the system and practical working of the University. They point to their empty or their dilettanti classes. . . With very few exceptions young men do not come to them to learn in earnest the Sciences which they teach; were they removed, save one or two, their loss would be felt only in the social intercourse of Oxford; . . they are not incorporated into the one single business of Oxford, the preparation for the degree. The loss thus inflicted on the nation is great and serious.

"Many persons, however, maintain that the two offices of education and of rearing learned men cannot be carried on together at Oxford,¹ and that the work of education is so valuable as not to allow of any rivalry on the part of the other. But if one of these two duties must be abandoned, it behoves those who protest against any alteration of College studies to consider whether the renunciation of learning is consistent with the oaths and obligations of Fellows. The endowments of the Fellowships were not founded to help a young barrister in London, or to eke out the scanty incomes of country curates, or to enable unbeneficed clergymen to wait for a College living, or even to provide schoolmaster-tutors to educate the young men of the land. They were destined

¹ Newman was of this opinion. See his *Idea of a University*, pp. 13-14.

for the maintenance of students. So certainly was this the design of Collegiate foundations, that there is no obligation lying on Colleges to take in members not attached to foundations. It rests entirely with the Heads of Houses to shut or open their gates against the admission of independent members; and if they refused to license the opening of Halls, the work of education would be completely arrested for all except a few undergraduate Fellows. No plainer proof can be needed to show that the educating of young men for the various professions of life is not the fulfilling of the duties laid by founders on the Colleges they created. . . But there need not be any collision of duties. Both may be fulfilled in harmonious working."

Mr. Price's proposals were:—

I. That the first examination be placed at Matriculation, and be required from all candidates for admission at all Colleges alike.

II. The examination for the B.A. Degree to be divided into two parts. The first part to take place after two years residence. The remaining part to take place at the end of the undergraduate course.

III. That every undergraduate be placed under the instruction of Tutors for two years only in order to be prepared for the first part of the B.A. examination.

IV. That the present fee for tuition, now charged for four years, be paid to the Tutor for two years only; and that the fee for the remaining two years be transferred in one payment, to the public Professors.

V. That there be three public Professors appointed in each of the departments of Divinity, History, and Philosophy; that every undergraduate be bound to attend a Professor's class in each of these departments; and that he have the right, out of the three Professors in each branch, to select the one to whom he shall attach himself.

VI. That the Professorial fee, that is the sum now charged for tuition for two years, be divided into three equal parts: one part to be paid to that Professor in each of the three departments in whose class the undergraduate shall have enrolled himself.

VII. That a fixed salary of £400 a year be provided by

the University for each of the Professors, exclusively of the fees paid by the pupils.

VIII. That there be appointed a separate Board of Examiners for each of the three departments; and that at least one of the public Professors of each department be a member of the Board.

IX. That each Professor be required to give two courses of lectures: one for undergraduates; a second for Bachelors and other graduates.

The scheme here propounded is obsolete in many respects, but it has the great merit of proceeding on general principles,—an entrance examination, a systematic division of teaching between the University and the Colleges, provision for advanced study and a career for the teacher.

The second pamphlet was published when the author had become a Professor, and was stirred in his mind by the Report of the Royal Commission of 1872 on the Revenues of the University, and Mr. Gladstone's statement in the House of Commons that it was "the opinion of the Government that no Government can exist which for a moment maintains that the consideration of University Reform, and consequently legislation of some kind will not form part of its duty." He thus states the position:—

"That the University has 'requirements,' that there are 'University' purposes which ought to be provided for, is proclaimed by the Report of the Council and admitted by every one connected with Oxford; and thus the vital question becomes, What are these requirements of the University, these University purposes?" What follows is still so pertinent to the actual state of things, that no excuse is needed for giving it with some fulness.

"Very inadequate ideas, I fear, prevail throughout the nation at large, and even in Oxford herself, as to what the University really wants, what the defects are under which it labours, and what the objects which University Reform should seek to accomplish. The common notion is that many Professorships of various kinds ought to be founded, that the mode of Professorial appointments should be improved, that additional Readerships should be brought into play, that facilities ought to be given for allowing the

educational staff to marry, that the range of subjects taught should be enlarged, whilst, on the material side, funds ought to be allowed for 'buildings and institutions.' I feel myself sorrowfully bound to declare my conviction that if fifty Professorships and as many Readerships were created, and these other purposes provided for in addition, and nothing more done, University Reform will not have been touched, and the call on Parliament to take up this great national problem will remain as urgent as ever."

Professor Price then points out that the evil dilated on in his first pamphlet remains unabated. "Oxford is afflicted with a severe malady. . . The ablest and most promising of her students shew a marked tendency to quit the University and to devote their knowledge, their talents, and their lives to other professions up and down the country; . . on every side a University career is dwarfening in comparison with the brilliant prospects held out by the endless pursuits spread through the national life. This evil, by itself alone, loudly demands a remedy, and assuredly Professorships and Readerships, as they are now constituted, are no such remedy. . . There is the yet graver matter that there is, speaking generally, no true career of work in Oxford, no sphere presenting an ever-deepening interest to the man who embraces it, no line of active duty ever impelling the University teacher to make the most of himself, to be constantly training himself to a more efficient discharge of his office, no true and real profession. . . This unhappy state of things is the consequence of the unsoundness of the machinery which Oxford employs. Two public duties are imposed on her: . . . to make adequate provision for research; . . secondly to give the best attainable education to the young men committed to her care. . . She performs both these great functions, fulfils both these clear duties imperfectly.

"Let us now consider the first duty of the University, the promotion of research. The forethought of past ages made provision by large endowments for this purpose. The long array of Theological, Moral and Literary Sciences figures grandly in the list of its Professors. The physical sciences have made their appearance in this region. . . The world supposes that these men of

deservedly high reputation are actively employed in the education of those hosts of students who throng the Colleges of the University. . . The supposition is a pure delusion. The students of Oxford do not belong to her Professors, nor the Professors to the students. There is no organic connection between them, and it is high time that the country should thoroughly grasp the fact. . . The Professors do not teach the Undergraduates, except in the physical sciences, where the true relation between teachers and pupils exists. . . They do not command the Examinations: their knowledge is not the standard which guides the distribution of honours or of fellowships. The University supplies no motive to Professors to improve themselves and extend its learning. That increase of learning has no value for the Undergraduates who are preparing for the Examinations. . . Nor does the University hold out to them the ordinary inducements of a great profession to exert and improve themselves. No prospect of reward, whether of money or position, stimulates their efforts. Their stipends are fixed, and in most cases miserably small, if regarded as the permanent status of a whole life."

Professor Price then examines the position of the College teacher. "He is weighted by the University with most serious disadvantages. In the first place, he begins at the outset with a maximum of financial reward. The Undergraduate, flushed with honours from the Schools, quickly finds himself installed in a Fellowship, a Tutorship and one or two College offices. More he can scarcely acquire. The University holds up before him no career of increasing pecuniary advantage. To become a Professor is to lose income, to lose pupils, to lose influence in the University as a teacher. . . Then, secondly, his time is fully occupied with mechanical labour in the office of teaching. . . But it is not improving labour; the germ of progress in knowledge is not contained in it. . . Then there springs up the painful fact, which almost demands to be called a law, that the Tutors, as they move on in years, are supplanted in authority and influence among the Undergraduate Students by their juniors, by those who

more recently emerged from the Examinations and their Honours.

“What must now be said of the second great function imposed upon the University,—the education which it is its duty to impart? . . . The answer is easy and decisive. It is an education in the hands of young men, and given by young men; it is not, for by the nature of man it cannot be, what it ought to be. . . Was Arnold no more powerful teacher at the end than he was at the commencement of his scholastic career? . . . There are doubtless young Tutors at Oxford who possess equal ability and capacity for progress with Arnold; but he was not, like them, sentenced to have his onward movement arrested by pupils who cared only for honours to be won at examinations from which the spirit of true progress was absent. He was not doomed to discover that his own advance in thought and knowledge would have no value for his scholars, nay, would even be regarded as an impediment to the attainment of a first class, and to be avoided.

“And now, is there a remedy for this lamentable state of things? There is a remedy, and it will be found in the removal of the cause which creates the harm. The Colleges have absorbed the University, as Sir William Hamilton shewed long ago, and are responsible for the injuries which have ensued; the restoration of the University is able to heal the wound. The students and their education belong of right to the University, but the Colleges have appropriated them. The University acts upon them only through the Examinations, but the Examinations are in the hands of the College Tutors. The Examinations can be only what the College Tutors choose to make them. . . This relation—this incorporation of the Undergraduates into the Collegiate system instead of into the University—is the source of the evil which has been above described. . . The College, further, receives the fees for tuition, and distributes them among its Fellows at its pleasure, and with the fees are necessarily connected the duty to teach, and the right to enforce attendance at the College Lectures. This is the decisive fact in the whole system of Oxford. . . The Oxford Student is not in the possession of the Professors,

he is owned in absolute sovereignty by the College Tutors. . . . We are thus brought to the conclusion that there is but one single remedy for the unsound machinery which Oxford employs for accomplishing her two great purposes—that the teaching of the students and their fees should belong to the University, and not to the Colleges.”

The Professor then presents a scheme in general terms. “Its leading features ought to be professional advancement, growing in efficiency, remuneration, authority, and academical interest.” The place of the College Tutors would be taken by Sub-Professors. The fees paid by the students would belong to the University officers, but there would be a graduated scale of salaries. The ambition of the Sub-Professor would be to become a Professor and chief in his own department. A leading position in the work of the Examinations would also be assigned to the Professors, who would be appointed by improved methods.

“But now the objection will be loudly raised—such a change would be a revolution. It would destroy the one distinguishing characteristic of the Universities of England, the College system. . . . But let me ask, is the College feeling, the essence of College life destroyed by the system of joint-teaching by combined Colleges? . . . And is it not a practice growing at Oxford . . . to call in the aid of teachers from other Colleges, or from general residents in the University? On the new system, most, probably all the Sub-Professors would be Fellows of Colleges, and then the relation of the College Staff to the Undergraduates would be precisely what it is now in the combined Colleges. The only difference would be that the College Staffs would be appointed to the teaching office, not by a College arrangement, but by the election of the University; the University would have to choose from the same men. But the altered mode of appointment would place them under different conditions in respect of their academical career; and this would be entirely pure gain. Many of the ablest Fellows who now leave the University for other professions would enlist in its service; and that would be an unmixed advantage for the College, as well as for the Undergraduates and the University.

"But a still stronger bond may be devised for attaching the Undergraduate to his College. He needs something closer than the teaching of the combined Tutor or the Sub-Professor. He wants a friend who knows him personally and familiarly. . . A Vice-Head would exactly meet these requirements. . . I conclude that the objection that the College, its moral, intellectual and personal value, would be deeply injured, if not destroyed, by the creation of the Sub-Professoriate, has no foundation in fact. The fortunes and feelings of the Undergraduate would be as much bound up with the College as they are now."

Newman's own verdict on the question at issue may fitly close this chapter.

"I am," writes Newman,¹ "for both views at once, and think neither of them complete without the other. I admire the Professor, I venerate the College. The Professorial system fulfils the strict idea of a University, and is sufficient for its *being*, but it is not sufficient for its *well-being*. Colleges constitute the *integrity* of a University. . . Taking a broad view of history, we shall find that Colleges are to be accounted the maintainers of order, and Universities the centres of movement."

But Newman, conservative as he was, had still strong and decided views on the historical aspect of the case. In a later chapter of the same book he says,² "Such an united action of the Collegiate and the National principle, far from being prejudicial, was simply favourable to the principle of an University. It was a later age which sacrificed the University to the College. We must look to the last two or three centuries, if we would witness the ascendancy of the College idea in the English Universities, to the extreme prejudice, not indeed of its own peculiar usefulness (for that it has retained) but of the University itself." These views are developed in the chapter entitled "Abuses of the Colleges."³ "The University is for the world, and the College is for the nation. The University is for the Professor, and the College for the Tutor; the University is for the

¹ *Historical Studies*, Vol. III., p. 182.

² p. 224.

³ p. 228, *et seq.*

philosophical discourse, the eloquent sermon, or the well-contested disputation; and the College for the catechetical lecture. The University is for Theology, Law, and Medicine, for Natural History, for Physical Science, and for the sciences generally and their promulgation; the College is for the formation of character, intellectual and moral, for the cultivation of the mind, for the improvement of the individual, for the study of literature, for the classics, and those rudimental sciences which strengthen and sharpen the intellect. The University being the element of advance, will fail in making good its ground as it goes; the College, from its conservative tendencies, will be sure to go back, because it does not go forward. It would seem as if an University seated and living in Colleges, would be a perfect institution, as possessing excellencies of opposite kinds."

But Newman saw that the reality was widely different from his ideal picture. "This seems to me," he writes,¹ "the critical evil in the present state of the English Universities, not that the Colleges are strong, but that the University has no practical or real jurisdiction over them. Over the members of Colleges it has jurisdiction, but even then, not as such, but because they are its own members also; over the Head of the College, over the Fellows, over the corporate body, over its property, over its officers, over its acts and regulations within its own precincts, the University has no practical jurisdiction at all. The Tutor indeed is an University officer by the Statutes, but the College has made it its own."

Newman instances as a further proof of College usurpation that "to this day, though separate Colleges properly insist on the necessary qualifications, in the case of those who are to be admitted to their Lectures, the University itself is not allowed to exercise its reasonable right of examining its members before it matriculates them."² Newman, however, was under no illusions as to the difficulty of making the University supreme and the Colleges subordinate. "The same spirit which destroyed the legal incorporation of the religious principle, was the

¹ p. 235.

² pp. 238-9.

jealous enemy also of the intellectual; and the civil power could as little bear an University as it bore a Church. Accordingly Oxford and Cambridge shared the fate of the Hierarchy; the component parts of those Universities were preserved, but they themselves were superseded; and there would be almost as great difficulties now in Protestant England, in restoring its Universities to their proper place, as in restoring the Church.”¹

A further difficulty would be found in the great hold the Colleges have on their members. Here is Newman's well-known picture of the College system:—

“There is no political power in England like a College in the Universities; it is not a mere local body, as a Corporation or a London company; it has allies in every part of the country. When the mind is most impressionable, when the affections are warmest, when associations are made for life, when the character is most ingenuous and the sentiment of reverence is most powerful, the future landowner, or statesman, or lawyer, or clergyman comes up to a College in the Universities. There he forms friendships, there he spends his happiest days; and whatever is his career there, brilliant or obscure, virtuous or vicious, in after years, when he looks back on the past, he finds himself bound by ties of gratitude to the memories of his College life. He has received favours from the Fellows, he has dined with the Warden or Provost; he has unconsciously imbibed to the full the beauty and the music of the place. The routine of duties and observances, the preachings and the examinations and the lectures, the dresses and the ceremonies, the officials whom he feared, the buildings or gardens that he admired, rest upon his mind and his heart, and the shade of the past becomes a sort of shrine to which he makes continual silent offerings of attachment and devotion. It is a second home, not so tender, but more noble and majestic and authoritative. Through his life he more or less keeps up a connection with it and its successive sojourners. He has a brother or an intimate friend on the foundation, or he is training up his son to be a member of it. When he hears that a blow is levelled at the Colleges, and that they are in com-

motion—that his own College, Head and Fellows, have met together and put forward a declaration calling on its members to come up and rally round it and defend it, a chord is struck within him, more thrilling than any other; he burns with *esprit de corps* and generous indignation; and he is driven up to the scene of his early education, under the keenness of his feelings, to vote, to sign, to protest, to do just what he is told to do, from confidence in the truth of the representations made to him, and from sympathy with the appeal. He appears on the scene of action ready for battle on the appointed day, and there he meets others like himself, brought up by the same summons; he gazes on old faces, revives old friendships, awakens old reminiscences, and goes back to the country with the renewed freshness of youth upon him. Thus, wherever you look, to the North or South, to the East or West, you find the interests of the Colleges dominant; they extend their roots all over the country, and can scarcely be overturned, without a revolution.”¹

The picture may be too highly coloured for the present day, but considerations such as the above no doubt prompted Goldwin Smith to write at a later date (1868) of Oxford²: “I will briefly touch on the chief points; first, however, stating my belief that as this is a University of Colleges, a University of Colleges it will remain; that though, for the sake of the Colleges themselves, all monopolies ought to be abolished, no attempt to restore the old uncollegiate University can be successful on the ground occupied by these great foundations, with their wealth, their name, their social advantages; and that the rational objects whereat to aim are the extension of the Colleges, in number or accommodation, and their consolidation, without loss of their individuality, or of the emulation of which it is the spring, into a University, employing their combined resources for the common good. To treat their ascendancy as an encroachment, and to propagate expectations of the revival of a University in which they will again be mere private foundations is, I apprehend, futile; and such language is calculated only to drive them back more than ever into their noxious isolation.”

¹ pp. 233-235.

² *Reorganisation of the University of Oxford*, p. 13.

Mark Pattison, himself the Head of a House, thus sums up the matter from his own particular point of view¹ :—

“At the time of the last Commission, in 1850, our disposition was to urge the distinction between the University and the Colleges upon the Legislature and the public. Out of a just jealousy of their legal rights, the Colleges resented the inclination which was shown to treat their property as equitably convertible for the uses of a distinct Corporation. This was done notwithstanding; but, paralysed by our clamours and our undeniable right, the omnipotence of Parliament was only exerted to an extent which did not materially benefit the University, while it enabled the Colleges to complain of confiscation. Since our rights are no longer invaded, we have had time for reflection. We have learned that there is no conflict of objects or interests between the Colleges and the University—that they are, in fact, the same men under a different denomination. There was no point on which University reformers before 1850 had been more unanimous and decided than in the assertion that the usurpation of the Colleges had been the destruction of Oxford. The same complaint necessarily held a prominent place in the Blue-Book of the Commission. Even as late as 1856² we find Dr. Donaldson reflecting that ‘the subjection of the University to the Colleges is the cause of all that is wrong in the practical working of the Cambridge system’ (*Classical Learning*, p. 46.) Hence the watchword of reform was the ‘Professorial system.’ The Professor was the *University* officer, who had been supplanted by the Tutor, a *College* officer. Parliament was invoked to restore the teaching to the University officer. The Commission to which was entrusted the execution of the Act of 17 and 18 Victoria, c. 81, dared not do this. The teaching still remains in the hands of members of the Colleges. Yet we hear no more of the old complaint of the usurpation of University functions by the Colleges. The explanation of this is

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 46-48.

² Professor Bonamy Price, it will be remembered, wrote his second pamphlet in 1872, four years after the publication of Pattison’s suggestions.

that the reformers had seized upon the great evil of the place, but had assigned it to a wrong cause. But this inefficiency did not arise from the circumstance that the teacher was a Tutor and not a Professor, nor from the circumstance that he was a Fellow of a College, and not an unattached member of the University. I have always regarded the relation of Tutor and pupil as being a relation more efficacious for instruction than the relation of Professor and student. And I believe the soundest opinion among us inclines to the same side. The cause of the inefficiency of the teaching of Oxford in the old days was, as I have indicated elsewhere, to be sought in the low standard of attainment of the place, a standard common to the University and the Colleges. Provided the teacher be competent—*i.e.* provided he be a master in the science he professes to teach—he will gain in power by being brought into the close and confidential relation of Tutor. And University Professors are not always found to be at the level of existing knowledge in their special profession. . . . The University *versus* the College, then, though it may heretofore have served the purpose of ascertaining our rights, and awakening us to our duties, is no longer a relevant issue.”

Both sides of the question have thus been presented to the reader. An attempt to decide between them will be made later on.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION OF 1850.

The history of University Reform has now been traced through a period of fifty years—the first half of the nineteenth century. How much has been accomplished in this time? There has been interminable discussion, a ceaseless output of articles and pamphlets, abortive attempts in both Houses of Parliament, but exceedingly little practical action. Oxford has instituted a competitive examination system, and Cambridge has improved and extended a similar system which was already in existence, but beyond this next to nothing has been done. Yet this little has had important results especially outside the two Universities. The rise in this country of the modern system of competitive examinations may fairly be dated from the Oxford Examination Statute of 1850. That enactment and the extensions which followed made the Prize Fellowship possible and gradually intensified competition. The increased spirit of emulation produced the private tutor or “coach,” the highly-skilled teacher whose function it is to impart the knowledge which the Universities demand in their examinations, but which neither they nor the Colleges supply. In Cambridge University private tuition was in great request, especially in Mathematics, and Hopkins and Routh are still remembered as two extraordinarily efficient Senior Wrangler makers. Along with the Prize Fellowships has come an increased number of Open Scholarships and Exhibitions, as the Colleges more and more competed with one another for the future winners of their Fellowships. The force of competition has thus invaded the Public Schools, and the

foreseeing parent now-a-days sends the boy of promise to a Preparatory School where he is crammed for the open scholarships of a Public School, thence to the Public School where he continues his specialised studies with a view to a College Scholarship, and so on to the Fellowship. This has not been the end of the matter. The examination system has spread everywhere. It conquered the Civil Service, first in India, then at home. Mr. Robert Lowe, himself an Oxford man, had "procured the insertion in the India Bill of 1853 of a provision throwing open the great service of India to competition for all British-born subjects."¹ For the same reform in the Home Service "the inspiration proceeded from Oxford. Two of the foremost champions of the change were Temple (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury) and Jowett, and in the beginning of 1855 Mr. Gladstone proposed to these two reformers that they should take the salaried office of Examiners under the Civil Service scheme."² The examination system even got as low down as the elementary schools, and in the hands of Mr. Robert Lowe produced what was known as "payment by results." Our age has thus become emphatically an age of examinations. The University of Cambridge does not disdain to hold a Preliminary Local Examination where the candidates may be as young as they please, the only restriction being that they should not be over fourteen. The Ordinary B.A. Examination at Cambridge can be taken as often as one likes, so that persons so minded may, if they go the right way to work, be examined from early childhood to advanced old age. There are endless examining bodies, all with their separate and sometimes competing examinations. Signs are not wanting of a reaction, and the cry is being heard among educationists that a halt must be called, that examinations must be simplified and their number reduced. Whatever may be the result of this movement, the fact remains that the Universities, by their record in this matter, have proved that they are not the secluded and remote bodies they are sometimes conceived to be, and that what is done in them quietly and almost secretly,

¹ Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 510.

² *Ib.* Vol. I., p. 512.

may have a profound effect on national practice and national life.¹

The little that the Universities effected in the way of internal improvement from 1800 to 1850 is sufficient comment on the wisdom of those who are always advising that these bodies should be left alone and allowed to reform themselves from within. But by 1850 public opinion was too strong to be any longer resisted. Attention has been called in Chapter III. to the action taken in Parliament in 1837 and the demand then made for a Royal Commission. The story may be taken up from the point where it was there left. In May, 1844, Mr. W. D. Christie, M.P., moved in the House of Commons an Address to the Queen to issue a Commission to inquire into all matters relating to the statutes, revenues, trusts, privileges, and general condition as regards learning and religion, of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Colleges and Halls therein. While the hon. Member was speaking, the House was counted out. In April of the next year, 1845, Mr. Christie again raised the

¹ The upholders of the modern examination system might not be so enamoured of it, if they knew where it originally came from. "The introduction of the system of emulation and prizes into the higher studies is historically traceable to the Jesuits. The adoption of the principle of perpetual supervision, of repeated examinations, of weekly exercises, produced marvellous results in the Jesuit Colleges. For a century and a half these establishments carried all before them, and earned the praises of all, even Protestant, observers, who contrasted their energy and zeal with the lifeless routine of the old Universities. It was not till the first half of the 18th century that opinion began to turn. It required time for the experiment of external stimulus applied to intellectual development to be fairly tried and judged. It was then found, that, beneath this brilliant show of College exercises and prizes, was concealed a starved and shrivelled understanding. The work done in class was pattern work; but the pupil whom the institution turned out was a washed-out, frivolous, superficial being. Without any hold either on the verities of science, or on the recorded experience of history, he was at the mercy of the opinions and the superstitions of the day. All the learning and knowledge, which was in the possession of the civilised communities of Europe, existed outside the Jesuit seminaries, as well as outside the old Universities of France and England. The rising tide of progressive opinion engulfed the Jesuit establishments, . . . but one thing was adopted unchanged from the Jesuit method. This was the system of constant examination." Thus writes Mark Pattison in the *Essays on the Endowment of Research*, pp. 18-20. Sir William Hamilton, at p. 769-770 of his *Discussions* gives the ordinary arguments in favour of examinations as laid down by Melancthon in his *De Studiis Adolescentum*, and adds the testimony of other distinguished writers. Professor Sayce, in his contribution to the *Essays on the Endowment of Research*, puts the arguments on the other side in a convenient form.

question and moved the same resolution. It was seconded by Mr. Ewart, and supported by Mr. Wyse, Mr. Hume and Lord Palmerston. It was opposed by Sir Robert Inglis, Mr. Beresford Hope and Mr. Goulburn, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and on a division was rejected by 143 votes to 82, a majority of 61.¹

The day of success did not come till five years later. On April 23rd, 1850, Mr. James Heywood, M.P. for North Lancashire, moved the following resolution in the House of Commons:—

“That all systems of academical education require from time to time some modification, from the change of external circumstances, the progress of opinion, and the intellectual improvement of the people.

“That in the ancient English and Irish Universities, and in the Colleges connected with them, the interests of religious and useful learning have not advanced to an extent commensurate with the great resources and high position of these bodies: that Collegiate Statutes of the 15th century occasionally prohibit the local authorities from introducing any alterations into voluminous codes, of which a large portion are now obsolete; that better laws are needed to regulate the ceremony of matriculation and the granting of Degrees, to diminish the exclusiveness of the University Libraries, to provide for a fairer distribution of the rewards of scientific and literary merit, to extend the permission of marriage to Tutors of Colleges, and to facilitate the registration of electors for the Universities; that additional checks might be considered with reference to the continued extravagance of individual students: and that the mode of tenure of College property ought to be ameliorated, particularly in Ireland:

“That, as it is Her Majesty’s right and prerogative to name Visitors and Commissioners to inquire into the ancient Universities and Colleges of England and Ireland, an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to issue her Royal Commission of Enquiry into the state of the Universities and Colleges of Oxford, Cambridge, and

¹ Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. IV., pp. 668, 676.

Dublin, with a view to assist in the adaptation of those important institutions to the requirements of modern times."

"Mr. Heywood," says Molesworth,¹ "had himself been educated at Trinity College, Cambridge; but being a Unitarian he had been prevented from taking his degree by a regulation of the University requiring all persons who wished to graduate to sign a declaration that they were *bona-fide* members of the Church of England. In this respect Cambridge was more liberal or more fortunate than the sister University; for while she only required a declaration of Church membership before taking the degree, the other University made it a condition of matriculation. Thus the Nonconformists, repelled at Oxford at the very entrance, found an asylum at Cambridge, received there the best education the University could afford, might attain to the highest honours she conferred on her successful students, and were only stopped at the point of taking the degree which should crown and complete a University career. Mr. Heywood was well known to be enthusiastically attached to his *alma mater*; he had devoted much time and labour to the examination of its statutes and the study of its constitution; he had thoroughly mastered the question in all its bearings; he had ascertained how much the resources of the Universities were wasted; and how much need there was of some means of reforming the abuses that had grown up in the course of ages, and of adapting the curriculum of University teaching to the circumstances of the times. He was also anxious to redress the grievances of which the Dissenters complained."

To the surprise of the House, the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, announced that, though he could not accept the motion, the Government would advise Her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission of Enquiry for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Mr. Roundell Palmer (afterwards the first Lord Selborne) objected that the proposed Commission would be illegal, and moved the adjournment of the debate. The Attorney-

¹ *History of England*, Vol. II., p. 338.

General (Sir John Jervis) explained that the Commission the Government proposed to issue was merely to receive evidence voluntarily given. The motion for the adjournment of the debate was then carried by 273 to 31.

On May 8th Lord John Russell, without waiting for the resumption of the debate, sent a letter to Prince Albert, the Chancellor of Cambridge University, and to the Duke of Wellington, the Chancellor of Oxford University,¹ explaining the voluntary nature of the Commission, and finally stating that "the utmost care will be taken in selecting Commissioners, who may not only be well qualified for their important task, but who may inspire confidence and respect by their character and position."

The same month a number of resident members of the Senate of Cambridge University addressed a long remonstrance to Prince Albert, their Chancellor, opposing the Commission on the familiar grounds that the University was reforming itself already, and that time was necessary to see the effect of the improvements made. In particular they objected to the Government's suggestion that "one object of such inquiry was to be to ascertain means by which the instruction given in the Colleges should be rendered serviceable in preparing Students for the Examinations in new subjects of study, lately instituted by the University"—(the Moral Sciences Tripos, and the Natural Sciences Tripos).

"We have no wish to deny," the memorialists continued, "that such a harmony of connexion between the subjects of College study and of University examinations should exist. . . But we cannot help looking with the greatest alarm at the prospect of having attempts made to establish such a connexion of College and University subjects, by the action of any power extraneous to the University and the Colleges. We

¹ There had been method in the choice of these distinguished personages. "Nor had the Universities neglected the more obvious means of resisting the attacks of their assailants. Oxford had secured as her Chancellor the Great Duke, who was said to command majorities in the House of Lords; while Cambridge, wiser, as she fancied, in her generation than her sister, had wooed and won the protection of Royalty itself, and felt safe under the shadow of the Throne." *Campion in Cambridge Essays*, 1858, p. 165.

conceive that any attempt to compel the Colleges to appoint teachers or to reward proficients, by external agency, would be an interference with their internal freedom of a kind utterly unheard of except in the worst times, and altogether destructive of their just and ancient corporate rights.”¹ They hinted also that there might be a refusal to give evidence. The Vice-Chancellor, the Rev. Dr. Cartmell, Master of Christ’s College, also addressed a remonstrance to the Chancellor, in which he said that the issuing of a Commission would be taken to imply that in the opinion of Her Majesty’s Ministers the governing body of the University were unfit for their position; thus regarded it would be an affront and an indignity, and as such would be resented. This last word in italics.

Prince Albert replied on May 27th that he had hoped the Universities would have been allowed to go on without extraneous interference, but as the Government was irrevocably pledged to a Commission, he recommended that it should be received in a friendly spirit.²

On July 18th the House of Commons resumed the debate, when Mr. John Stuart proposed the following amendment: “That any advice given to Her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission for inquiry into the state of the revenues and management of any Colleges or Halls of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, not being of Royal foundation, tends to a violation of the laws and constitution of her kingdom, and of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty’s subjects.” This amendment was supported by Mr. Gladstone. He was at that time one of the members for Oxford University, for which seat he had been returned in 1847, and had not yet shaken off his reactionary views. Mr. John Morley³ describes the speech as “the last manifesto, on a high theme and on a broad scale, of that Toryism from which this wonderful pilgrim had started on his shining progress.” The debate was again adjourned by 160 to 138. On August 31st, before any further discussion had taken place, the Royal Commission was issued.

Such was the way in which the first step was taken in “a long journey towards the nationalisation of the

¹ Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. V., p. 13.

² *Ib.* pp. 17-18.

³ *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 498.

Universities." The Commission produced an effect even before it reported. On May 1st, 1851, by a unanimous vote, the Undergraduate Fellows of King's College, Cambridge, resolved to relinquish their "ancient and undoubted privilege to claim and receive the degree of Bachelor in Arts in the Senate House of the said University without having passed any of the previous examinations required from the undergraduates of other Colleges."¹ The Oxford Commissioners were able to report that New College had taken similar action. Certain peculiar privileges, however, still appertain to King's College. The Provost has absolute authority within the precincts, and, by special composition between this Society and the University, its Undergraduates are exempt from the power of the Proctors and other University Officers within the limits of the College.

The Oxford Commissioners were the Bishop of Norwich, Dr. A. C. Tait (then Dean of Carlisle), Dr. Jeune (Master of Pembroke College), Dr. Liddell, Head Master of Westminster School, J. L. Dampier, Professor Baden Powell, and the Rev. G. H. S. Johnson. The Rev. A. P. Stanley was appointed Secretary and Mr. Goldwin Smith Assistant Secretary. They began their sittings on October 19th, 1850, and reported on April 27th, 1852. Their duty was to "enquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues" of the University, and they carried out their task mainly by means of printed questions, though many witnesses were examined orally.

Their reception was creditable neither to the University nor to the Colleges. "The Governing Body," the Commissioners were compelled to say, "has withheld from us the information which we sought from the University through the Vice-Chancellor as its chief resident officer; and this, as has since been intimated to us, with the purpose of disputing the legality of Your Majesty's Commission. . . From the majority of the Colleges, as Societies, we have received no assistance. . . On the subject of the Revenues of the University, and of many of the Colleges, we have little authentic information to communicate. To state the amount and nature

¹ Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. V., p. 31.

of these Revenues with precision, we required the zealous assistance of the University and College authorities. In most instances such assistance has been withheld. For the sake of the University itself, we regret that a different course was not pursued."

Such are the words which meet the reader in the first two pages of the Oxford Report. Nevertheless the Commissioners gathered from individuals both inside and outside the University a vast amount of information. They specially instance Mr. Heywood, "who has liberally furnished the Commission, not only with copies of the translations of the various Statutes published by him, but with several manuscripts which he had caused to be transcribed at his own cost."

The Report itself is much more compact and better arranged than the subsequently-issued Cambridge Report, and has the great advantage of a summary of recommendations at the end. Mr. Gladstone thought it one of the ablest productions submitted to Parliament in his recollection.

It will be of interest to go at once to the central question of how the Commissioners viewed the University as a teaching body, involving the further question of the proper relations between itself and the constituent Colleges. The answer will be found on p. 45: "The absorption of the University by the Colleges has been often brought before us in the Evidence. Great as are the advantages which the Colleges have conferred on the University, we cannot doubt that both the one and the other have suffered from the extent to which the amalgamation has been carried; and that the restoration of the University to its proper superiority would, independently of all other considerations, be a great benefit. The monopoly of teaching by the Colleges has gone far to extinguish the Professorial system in Oxford, and, consequently, to impair, if not to destroy, the character of the University as a seat of learning. The absence of competition has encouraged the apathy which has rendered some of the most powerful and wealthy of the Colleges the least useful. The strong College feeling engendered by the present system has superinduced a neglect, we might almost say an unconsciousness, of the claims of the

University on the affections and the exertions of its Members, such as could hardly have existed had there been a body of men attached to the University, but unconnected with the Colleges. For these and other reasons we feel it to be a matter of great importance to raise up by the side of the Colleges an independent body, which will bear witness to the distinct existence of the University, and excite the Colleges to greater exertion."

Later on (beginning at p. 92), the Commissioners trace the "operation of the system of University Instruction, or rather its failure. . . During the Middle Ages, whilst the whole governing body of the University consisted of Teachers only, the flourishing state of the University indicated of itself a flourishing state of University teaching. These ancient Teachers generally gave place to the Praelectorships established by the University, or founded in certain Colleges; and these Praeceptors were (in part at least) superseded by the endowed Professors, who, in the Laudian Code, were formally acknowledged as the Instructors of the University. It may be, however, doubted whether the Professorial system ever attained a full development. . . The general fact is unquestionable that the Professors are not now the Teachers of the University; and that of all the functions of the Academic body, that which was once, and which in the Statutes is still presumed to be, the most important, might cease to exist altogether, with hardly any perceptible shock to the general system of the place."

The Commissioners then give reasons for restoring the Professorial system, and the old quarrel between Professors and Tutors rages over many passages of their Report. Mark Pattison is the foremost critic of the Professorial system, while Professor Halford Vaughan is the chief witness in its favour. The Commissioners proposed to establish Assistant-Professors, or Lecturers, a grade of Instructors subordinate to the Professors, but yet lecturing on the same subjects, and, if need be, acting as their deputies or substitutes.¹ They also came to the conclusion that the combination of Professorial and Tutorial teaching was "not only possible, but desirable,"²

¹ Report, p. 98.

² *Ib.* p. 99.

and quote in their support the authority of Jowett. They sum up in these words: "Our conclusion therefore is, that for any healthy and complete scheme of University Reform, it will be necessary to reconstruct the Professorial system, to procure for the Professors ample endowments, to raise them to an important position in the University, and to call to their aid a body of younger men, under the name of Lecturers, in order that the supremacy of Learning and Science may be duly recognised, that the permanent services of able men may be secured for Academical purposes, and that the Education of the people may be conducted on general principles acknowledged and authorised by the University."¹

The Commissioners next proceed to consider means for restoring the Professorial system. They suggest a new arrangement of the Staff, better methods of appointment, the removal of restrictions, guarantees for activity, increase of income, and power for the University to meet an advance, or an altered distribution in the several departments of knowledge, by making necessary changes with the consent of the Crown. Their other main proposals, the abolition of "close" Fellowships and Scholarships, and the creation of Non-Collegiate Students, both aimed at increasing the power of the University. By the abolition of the restrictions on endowments, they hoped for "a considerable accession of persons capable of doing honour to their respective Societies and serving the University."² They also expected that the Colleges would take advantage of their liberty to supplement the revenues of the University from their own resources.

The Commissioners, it will be seen, were cautious in the removal of restrictions on Fellowships. They were in favour of confirming the practices of non-residence and of celibacy, but of doing away with the obligations to take Orders, to resign a Fellowship on coming into property, and to proceed to the superior Degrees. Generally on the question of endowments they say: "These are the recommendations we have to offer for re-distributing the College revenues so as to meet the wants of the times. In this way the Scholarships

¹ *Ib.* p. 102.

² *Ib.* p. 153.

would become stimulants to all the Schools in the country; the Fellowships would act as rewards to those who are advancing in their studies; the Professorships and Lectureships would be an object for Fellows, and would raise the University to its proper position as a seat of learning.”¹ Here is a career marked clearly out in its successive grades.

As to University Government the Commissioners proposed:—

1. “That the University should henceforth have full authority to make, abrogate or alter Statutes, with the exception of a few Fundamental Articles not to be altered without the consent of the Crown or some other superior authority.”

2. “That the right of initiating measures should be confined to a body comprising Professors and other Academical Teachers as well as the Members of the Hebdomadal Board. For this purpose it may be expedient that the body called Congregation should be remodelled, so as to consist of all Heads of Houses, the Proctors, all Professors, and Public Lecturers, together with the Senior Tutors of all Colleges and Halls; that the members of this body should possess the right of originating measures; that it should be convened by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss measures, only on the written request of a fixed number of its Members; that it should be empowered to appoint Delegacies for discharging the functions usually belonging to the Committees of Deliberative bodies; that its members should be allowed to address the House in English; that measures, after being passed by this House of Congregation, should be proposed to the House of Convocation simply for acceptance or rejection, in the same manner that measures emanating from the Hebdomadal Board are now proposed; that, these changes being made, the Hebdomadal Board should continue to discharge its executive and administrative functions, and should also retain its present right of originating measures.”²

It is also noteworthy that Recommendation 11 runs:

¹ *Ib.* p. 181.

² *Ib.* p. 256.

“That there should be a public Examination for all young men before Matriculation.”

The Cambridge Commissioners were the Bishop of Chester, Dr. Peacock (Dean of Ely), Sir John Herschell, Sir John Romilly (Attorney-General), and Professor Adam Sedgwick. They appointed as their Secretary the Rev. W. H. Bateson, B.D., Public Orator of the University, and President and Senior Bursar of St. John's College. Their Report strikes one as by no means so able a document as that submitted by their colleagues at Oxford. It moves along in slow and ponderous style, dropping no doubt many pearls of wisdom by the way, but these have a knack of running into dark and unsuspected corners, and may easily be overlooked. It contains no summary of recommendations to aid the tired reader. Nevertheless it will be well to deal with it in some detail.

The chief abuses of which University reformers had made complaint were: (1) the obsolete character of the governing bodies; (2) the inadequacy and the inefficiency of the teaching; (3) the system of “close” Fellowships and Scholarships; (4) the expensiveness of a University course; and (5) Religious Tests. These five points will now be considered in order.

The question of organisation is but lightly handled. The Commissioners point out that on March 7, 1849, the University had appointed a Syndicate to revise the Statutes.¹ This Syndicate had prepared a Draft of an amended Code, which included proposals to alter the constitution of the *Caput Senatus*, to limit its powers, and to institute a Council of Legislation. The then existing Constitution of the University of Cambridge is thus described in terms which amplify the slight sketch previously given of it:—

“The Senate, or Legislative Body of the University, is divided into two Houses, corresponding to the Academical distinction of Regents and Non-Regents. The Regent House consists of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Proctors, the Taxors,² the Moderators, the Esquire

¹ *Report*, p. 3.

² Officials who fixed the rents of lodging-houses and hostels to save the undergraduates from extortionate charges.

Bedells,¹ provided they be Masters of Arts, all Masters of less than five, and Doctors of Divinity, Civil Law, and Physic, of less than two years standing; five years in the former case and two in the latter being the period during which the rules of the University impose a liability to perform the duties of Regency, that is of presiding at the public Disputations or Exercises in the Schools. The Non-Regent House is composed of Masters of Arts of more than five years standing, of Bachelors of Divinity who have previously been Masters of Arts, and Doctors of Divinity, Civil Law and Physic, of more than two years standing.

“From the Members of the two Houses there is formed a Council, called the *Caput Senatus*, or Head of the Senate; consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, a Doctor in each of the Faculties of Divinity, Civil Law, and Physic; one Non-Regent Master of Arts; and one Regent Master of Arts. The appointment of the five persons who are associated with the Vice-Chancellor in this Council is made annually in the following manner: The Vice-Chancellor proposes the names of five persons, who are qualified to serve in the several capacities. Each of the two Proctors also proposes the names of five other persons so qualified. Out of the fifteen thus proposed, the Vice-Chancellor, the Heads of Colleges, the Doctors of the three Faculties and the two Scrutators² elect, by a majority of votes, five; who, with the Vice-Chancellor constitute the *Caput* for the ensuing year. The ordinary subjects requiring the votes of the Senate are called Graces, under which name are now comprehended all Grants, Orders, and Rules made by the authority of the Senate for the administration of University affairs. The Graces are, in the first instance, submitted to the *Caput*; each member of which has, by the Statutes of Elizabeth, the power of rejection by his sole negative voice.³ A Grace, after

¹ Ornamental officials who are in personal attendance on the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor.

² Officials who counted the votes in the Non-Regent House.

³ This power of veto was not so absurd as it looks on the face of it, as any member of the Senate had the right to propose a Grace and have it voted on within twenty-four hours. Thus on Dec. 4, 1834, Prof. Pryme offered to the Senate two Graces for appointing Syndicates to consider the propriety of abolishing or modifying subscription on graduation. Both were rejected in the *Caput*. (Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. IV., p. 579.)

passing the Caput, is publicly recited, first by the Scrutators in the Non-Regent House, and next by the Proctors in the Regent House. The Congregation is then suspended for a customary interval of time; and, on its reassembling, the Grace is again recited in the Non-Regent House, where, in the case of any opposition to it, the Scrutators collect the votes. If it be passed there by a majority of votes, it is then forwarded to the Regent House, where the Proctors observe a like form in taking the opinion of that House. The Grace, if passed by them, thereby becomes valid, and is registered in the Records of the University.”¹

The Syndicate had shown decided conservatism in the way in which they dealt with the form of government here described. The Commissioners say: “We cannot hesitate to express our pleasure to find such a proposal emanating from the University itself. It has evidently been framed with careful deliberation, and with an especial view as well to preserve the balance of power among the several Colleges, as also to prevent the excitement and rivalries of a more popular and unlimited mode of appointment. The suggested scheme has received the unanimous approval of the Syndicate, and we hope it may receive the sanction of the Senate.”² Parliament, however, went beyond the Syndicate Report, and it is therefore unnecessary to say more about a form of government which never fully attained even a paper existence.

The second complaint of the reformers as to the inadequacy and inefficiency of the teaching at the Universities is the main charge, and there is abundant evidence that the Cambridge Commissioners so regarded it. Their chief criticism of the Professorial system as then existing occurs incidentally under the heading “Lecture Rooms,” and is as follows³:—“The Professors, in fact, are never called together, or co-operate as a body, and are subject to no authority or control beyond the special provisions of their several foundations; and if these are neglected, or have become inapplicable, there is no readily available means to enforce them in one case, or modify them in the other. As a natural consequence of this want of organisa-

¹ Report, p. 13.

² Report, p. 15.

³ Report, p. 115.

tion, there exists no arrangement by which the order of succession of the lectures is regulated and adjusted to the wants of the students, or by which a continuous system of public instruction, in any considerable department of study, can be properly carried out; and though the Vice-Chancellor, since the institution of the new Triposes in 1848, has been accustomed to issue, in the month of October, a programme of the lectures to be given by the Professors in the ensuing academical year, it is not formed as the result of a conference among them, but merely records their separate answers to a circular letter addressed to them with a blank column, which they are requested to fill up with the term, place, hour, and subject of their lectures."

They also report¹: "That there is a very general dissatisfaction with the present state of tuition in the University": and add, "It will also have been noticed that one of the chief embarrassments in the way of a satisfactory solution of the question consists in the difficulty which would be generally experienced by the smaller Colleges, if they were to attempt to provide a staff of Tutors competent, both in number and variety of attainments, to afford the requisite amount of instruction and with the requisite classification of the students, in all the departments of University study. Moreover, the difficulties to which we have referred, so far as they may have already been experienced by the smaller Colleges, in providing instruction in a sufficient amount and quality for the present University Examinations, must in a short time be greatly aggravated, now that the University has extended its range of honours and afforded to the student an opportunity to win distinctions in other important departments of human learning."

On the positive side they report:—"From the observations which we have premised we arrive at the conclusion, that in any plan which may be devised for ameliorating the state of University teaching, the two principal conditions to be satisfied are: (1) that there shall be a definite and permanent career provided for the teachers; and (2) that a reasonable latitude of choice

¹ pp. 74, 79.

should be allowed to the pupils as to what teachers they will select for their guidance. Two other conditions of a secondary character, and closely connected with each other, are: (1) that there shall be adequate facilities for the classification of pupils; (2) due economy in the administration of the system.”¹

The Commissioners were of opinion that it was very desirable that a general examination should be passed by all students in the course of their second year. “The requisite provision for preparing students for this preliminary examination, we are disposed to leave in the hands of the several Colleges. . . But for the higher duty of instructing those who had passed the preliminary examination, we are desirous of creating a numerous staff of Public Lecturers. We should prefer the title of Lecturer to that of Professor or Sub-Professor, mainly because we think the teaching of such persons must be for the most part catechetical, and therefore different from that of the Professors. A new title will also be desirable on other accounts, inasmuch as we shall propose that both the mode of appointment, the functions and the remuneration of these Instructors shall be different from any of those now known in the University. For we should propose that the remuneration of these teachers should be partly a fixed stipend dependent on continued residence within the University and on compliance with such regulations as may be framed for their guidance, and partly the fees paid by the particular pupils attending their respective classes. . . In our opinion it would be a satisfactory system if the payment (for College tuition), whatever might be its amount, which we think must be left to be determined by the University from time to time, were divided into two parts, according to such a proportion as might be deemed fitting, one of which should be devoted to the remuneration of the College Tutor acting in the capacity of sponsor or guardian of the student’s conduct, and the other should be appropriated to defray the cost of his instruction, being paid to the College up to the time of passing the general preliminary examination, and

¹ pp. 80, 81.

afterwards to the University for the maintenance of the Staff of Public Lecturers. . .

“A code of Bye-laws to be carefully framed by the authority of the Senate would be requisite to apportion among the different departments of study the fund which it is proposed to raise as well out of the quarterly payments of the students for tuition as by subsidies from the corporate funds of the several Colleges.

“It appears also, that another advantage will be derived from the institution of the office referred to. . It will be the means of retaining in the immediate service of the University a body of men of high character for learning and science. . .

“We have recommended, generally, that the staff of Instructors who are to conduct the public teaching of the University should be composed of two classes—Professors and Public Lecturers. The first class would consist of men whose character for learning and ability is fully established, holding permanent appointments, whose income should be mainly at least provided by the endowment of their Chairs; the second would be formed of men of less assured eminence, many of them just entering on public life, and looking for much of their remuneration, from their popularity as teachers, at least in those departments of study where the students are numerous, and where it is desirable or practicable to keep in full activity the principle of competition, without which their functions would sooner or later be usurped by other parties. But even as respects this second class, there are many departments of study where the number of students is necessarily small, and where the principle of competition would either cease to operate or involve a needless multiplication of teachers. In such cases it will rest with those in whom the appointment of such Professors or Lecturers is vested to select those who are known from their previous character and reputation to be fully competent for the duties which they are required to discharge.”

The Commissioners then turn their attention to the Boards of Studies which they have recommended in various parts of the Report and find that there are Professors enough to form the nucleus of the following Boards:—(1) Board of Theological Studies, (2) Board of

Legal Studies, (3) Board of Medical Studies, (4) Board of Mathematical Studies, (5) Board of Classical Studies, (6) Board of Natural Science Studies, (7) Board of Moral Science Studies. Engineering Studies were to be subordinate to the Board of Mathematical Studies to begin with, and Modern Language Studies to the Board of Moral Science Studies, to which also Modern History Studies were assigned.¹

Only one of these Boards was at that time in existence—the Board of Mathematical Studies, which consisted of the four Mathematical Professors, together with the Moderators and Examiners for the Mathematical Tripos for the year, as also those of the two years immediately preceding. Mathematics at this time still reigned supreme at Cambridge. “It is this department of study which is pursued in the University with the greatest earnestness, and which occupies the greatest number of teachers, comprehending a very great majority of the College and Private Tutors; and as long as success in the Mathematical Tripos continues to be the main avenue to Fellowships, its supremacy amongst other branches of academical study is not likely to be disturbed.”² The Commissioners were well pleased with the way in which this Board had done its work. It had presented two Reports, the first bearing date May 19, 1849, which were “documents of much interest.” It was clearly the model on which the new “General Council of Studies”³ was to be fashioned, and is thus described:—

“This Board, according to the constitution which we propose in other parts of our Report to give it, would be called upon to exercise larger regulating powers extending as well to lectures, and the cycle which they should follow, as to examinations. Questions of no small difficulty would present themselves in the distribution and organisation of the lectures. These lectures must be adapted also to the wants of students of various capacities and very different states of preparation; they must recognise and provide for such an amount of competition as will allow a sufficient freedom of choice to the student and stimulate the exertions of the Lecturer; above all,

¹ *Report*, p. 88.

² *Ib.* pp. 96, 97.

³ *Ib.* p. 104.

such a Board must have the power, subject to due regulation and control, of recruiting the body of Lecturers from time to time by the addition of young men of distinguished power and ability. We do not conceal from ourselves the difficulties which would attend the successful working out of this or any other system for conducting the studies of the University, designed to supersede another which has been so long in operation, connected with so many interests, and supported, as it undoubtedly would be, by all those who are adverse from principle or habit to all considerable changes; but we have ventured to propose it as being, in our opinion, calculated to remove some evils and anomalies which are of a very serious nature, and also to restore to the public teaching of the University its just influence and authority.”¹

The Commissioners continue to dole out their views all through the Report in this fragmentary fashion, so that when we reach the section dealing with the Board of Classical Studies, to which it was proposed to give the same powers as were to be given to the Mathematical Board, we find the following additional remarks:—

“It is, however, manifestly essential to the success of such a system of Lectures in this or any other department of learning or science that the attendance of students on the University Lecturers should not be obstructed by an unnecessary concurrence of Lectures on the same subjects in the Colleges; for it is obvious from the relation which exists between a student and his College, that in a competition for attendance upon University or College Lectures, where it can be enforced in the one case and not in the other, the compulsory lectures will always prevail. It is only by strictly defining the respective provinces of the University and the Colleges in the education of students, and by preventing irregular intrusions on them, either on the one part or the other, that they can be made to work harmoniously together. To secure this end, it appears to us to be necessary that every candidate for a Degree in Arts, or for Honours in any Tripos, should be required to produce a certificate of his having attended, during the last four Terms of his residence, such a Course

¹ *Ib.* p. 97.

of Public University Lectures as might be thought to be an appropriate and adequate preparation in his particular line of study.”¹

As for Boards of Study generally the Commissioners say²:—“We have sufficiently enlarged upon the importance of instituting Boards of Study, corresponding to the several courses by which the B.A., or the Professional Degrees may be attainable. The several Boards would be composed of Professors belonging to each particular branch of study, together with such other Members of the Senate as it might be thought expedient to unite with them. To these Boards we would confide the regulation of their several departments; their proceedings, when not merely administrative, being subject to the approbation of the Senate, and consequently to the revision of the Council of Legislation. We think that it would also be the province of each Board as well to select and nominate the Public Lecturers of their several branches of study, as also to secure in each branch due organisation of the teaching of the Public Lecturers and the Professors, to prescribe the cycle of subjects to be taught, the order in which they are to be taken, and to suggest and propose the arrangements and changes required from time to time to maintain the constant efficiency of the system of instruction.

“But there are many questions which may arise affecting the relations of these Boards to each other as well as to the whole body of the Professors, which will require from time to time to be considered and determined by some superior authority, such as a General Council of Studies.

“We recommend that a Council should be instituted, which should possess the power of nominating, for the sanction of the Senate, the candidates to fill vacant Professorships, when their election is not provided for by special Statutes; and it might be expedient to constitute the same body as a General Council of Studies, who should be authorised to meet from time to time, and to deliberate, and, when necessary, to report to the Senate upon all matters which relate to the public instruction of the

¹ *Ib.*, pp. 99, 100.

² *Ib.*, pp. 103, 104.

University, and to give unity of action to the Boards who preside over its several departments. In this Council all Professors would naturally be included. It might, however, be objected that if it were composed of Professors only, its members would be disposed to view the questions submitted to them rather with reference to the interests of the class to which they belonged than to those of the University at large; that in elections and the distribution of funds entrusted to them, a spirit of exclusion and favouritism might sometimes manifest itself, which would tend to provoke feelings of jealousy and distrust in other members of the University, and thus expose their recommendations to much opposition. In order to guard against the formation of such an exclusive spirit and to give to the constitution of the Board a more comprehensive and popular character, it would seem to be expedient to add a certain proportion of other members of the Senate. Thus the Vice-Chancellors of the current and past year, the Public Orator, the Registrary, the two Proctors, and the two Moderators of the current year, might be *ex officio* members of it. And if with them were combined a certain number of other persons, as for instance, two Heads of Colleges, appointed by their body, and eight members of the Senate, appointed by the Colleges according to a specified cycle, a body would be formed which would be little likely to be influenced by the personal interests and feelings of any predominant class of its members to such an extent as seriously to compromise its usefulness and impartiality."

Ten new Professorships were thought necessary by the Commissioners. These were:—

Two of Theology.

One of General Jurisprudence.

One of the Law of Nations and Diplomacy.

One of Anatomy.

One of Chemistry.

One of Latin.

One of Zoology.

One of Practical Engineering.

One of Descriptive Geometry.

As for the additional means of endowment thereby rendered necessary, the Commissioners were of opinion

that sufficient means might be found for all purposes without imposing upon the Colleges the burden of contributing from their corporate revenues a larger annual sum than under all circumstances might reasonably be expected of them,¹ but they were further of opinion that both staffs of Instructors, as well the College as the Public Lecturer, should be subsidised by payments out of the corporate funds of the several Colleges. To the same source they also looked for additional stipends in aid of the existing Staff of Professors, and to endow such new Chairs as may appear to be necessary.²

With regard to the principles upon which the emoluments of Professors should be regulated, the Commissioners quote with approval Sir William Hamilton's condensation of Lord Bacon's triple appeal to the Crown and to the Nation on the wisdom and necessity of dealing liberally with teachers,³ and add, "We should be induced not to fix the incomes of the Professors as high as that which other professional employments would generally secure for them, and in mentioning incomes varying from £400 to £800 per annum, attainable at a moderately early period of life, we indicate a scale by which the University would probably be able to command the services of men of the highest order in every department of science and learning. . . . In the framing of the Statutes for regulating the Professorships or Lectureships to be hereafter founded, or those already in existence, which receive an augmentation of income, there are some conditions which should be rigorously enforced. First, residence in the University for at least six months in the year. Secondly, that the whole or a considerable part of their salary should not be paid unless the required Lectures had been delivered. If, however, the approach of old age or continued illness should render the effective performance of duties no longer possible or no longer profitable to the University, then some part of the stipend in proportion to the length of service should be assigned to the Professor or Lecturer by way of pension with the title of *emeritus*."⁴

As for the method of appointment of Professors, the Commissioners say :—"If we assume that the appointment

¹ Report, p. 102.

² *Ib.* p. 85. Cf. Pattison, *Suggestions*, pp. 57, 58.

³ *Discussions*, Appendix C, p. 784.

⁴ Report, p. 115.

to Professorships which have been created by special Founders should continue to be regulated by the special provisions of their deeds of foundation, it becomes a question of no small difficulty, but of paramount importance, to determine the best and safest modes in which elections should be made to the Professorships already founded or to be hereafter founded by the University itself. . . . We should be disposed to recommend a middle course, entrusting to a General Board or Council of Studies the selection of one or more candidates to be by them nominated to the whole body of the Senate, for final confirmation or election.”¹

Let us next turn to the recommendations which concern the Colleges, as under this head Complaints numbered 2 and 3 above are dealt with incidentally. They are:—

That a revision of the ancient Statutes of the Colleges has become a matter of urgent importance.²

That it would be highly beneficial to the several Colleges if certain limitations on the election to Fellowships (excepting the case of particular Schools) were entirely removed by an enactment of the Legislature; and that such limitations should be prohibited in the case of future accession of endowment.³

That it would be a great benefit to those Colleges in which Bye-Fellowships exist (*i.e.* Fellowships not on the Foundation, and giving the holders no share in the government of the College), if gradually and without prejudice to the interests of the existing Fellows, the different benefactions were incorporated and the Fellowships made more nearly equal.⁴

That in the three larger Colleges there should be an annual election of Fellows at a fixed time; and that in the other Colleges it would be convenient if, upon a vacancy occurring in a Fellowship, the space of twelve months were allowed to fill it up, beyond which time it should not be in the power of the Society to keep any of their Fellowships vacant.⁵

That the law of some of the Colleges, requiring the

¹ Report, p. 103.

² pp. 150, 151, 152.

³ pp. 157-168.

⁴ pp. 167, 168.

⁵ p. 170.

Fellows to enter into Holy Orders, might be relaxed so as to allow of a reasonable interval of time before a newly-elected Fellow should be required to take Orders or vacate his Fellowship.¹

That Fellows of Colleges should not be required to reside, due precaution being taken for the transaction of the ordinary business of the several societies.²

That in revising the Statutes of the University and of the Colleges, it would be necessary to make provision for the continuance of the rule by which the condition of celibacy is attached to the tenure of all Fellowships.³

That it would be advantageous if it were enacted by the Legislature, that where a beneficial College lease has been allowed to expire, no lease of such property should be valid for which any fine or premium is accepted.⁴

That it would be highly desirable to make provision for periodical visitations of the several Colleges, and that it would be expedient to remove any doubts as to where the Visitorial authority resides in particular Colleges.⁵

The practical means by which the recommendations of the Report were to be carried out are thus stated :—

“Having now indicated the principles upon which we think that any reform of the University and Colleges should be conducted, it remains to consider the practical means by which such principles could most satisfactorily be applied. There is no doubt much within the power of the several Colleges themselves. We believe, however, that no complete correction of the evils we have pointed out can be effected unless under the authority of the Legislature. How this is to be applied is a matter of grave consideration. The revision of Statutes, the examination of sub-foundations, the incorporation of Bye-Fellows, the adjustment of the claims of Schools, the determination of the relative number of Fellows and Scholars, and many other points which we have noticed, involve a multiplicity of details which demand the greatest care, diligence, and prudence for their correct and satisfactory settlement. If Parliament should entertain the question of the reform of the University and its Colleges, it seems to us that it would be convenient to lay

¹ p. 171.

² pp. 171, 172.

³ p. 172.

⁴ p. 199.

⁵ p. 199.

down, in an Act of the Legislature, the principles on which such reforms should be conducted, and to entrust a Board with temporary powers necessary for carrying them into effect. . . . The results of the deliberations of such a Board might properly be referred to Your Majesty in Council for final sanction.”¹

As for the fourth grievance—the expensiveness of a University career, the Commissioners’ finding is that it was substantially non-existent. They say: “We have great satisfaction in expressing our opinion that the expenses of the great majority of the students are moderate. The fact reflects credit both on themselves, and on the authorities of the University and the several Colleges. By reference to the Evidence it will be seen that the necessary expense of residence is small; and that the actual average expense does not exceed a reasonable limit.”²

With a view to the reduction of this necessary expense the system of Unattached Students had been strongly advocated. The Commissioners reported against it in these words:—“It has been contended that it would be desirable to revert to ancient practice as far as to allow of matriculated students of the University, not attached to any College or Hall. The question has received our careful consideration, and we are of opinion that it would not be expedient to adopt any change of that nature in the present system of the University. It appears to us that one of the most striking and valuable characteristics of our English Universities is to be found in the domestic system of their education, by which habits of order and moral control are most satisfactorily obtained. . . . The two systems of Collegiate and Unattached Students seem to us to be hardly compatible with one another; at least we cannot doubt that great difficulties would be experienced in blending them harmoniously together, if the class of students not affiliated to some Collegiate body were recognised, and afterwards received any considerable accession of numbers. We come, therefore, to the conclusion that the extension of the benefits of the University, so as to embrace a larger number of students

¹ pp. 199, 200.

² *Ib.* p. 18.

than at present exists, and more proportionate to the great increase of our population and national wealth, must be sought in a corresponding growth of our Collegiate system, and in such improvements of the existing foundations as may render them more generally accessible and more generally useful.”¹

They make one practical suggestion. “We think, however, it would be very advantageous if buildings were erected for the reception of students in immediate connexion with, and under the direct control of, the Collegiate bodies. For such Affiliated Halls we apprehend that no fresh powers are required. They appear to have existed in ancient times: sometimes under the name of Pensionaries; in other cases particular Hostels were attached to Colleges, an instance of which is furnished by Physwick Hostel, belonging to Gonville Hall, which was included in the site of Trinity College on its foundation in 1546.”²

It will thus be seen that the two Commissions came to opposite conclusions as to the admission of Non-Collegiate Students. The Oxford Commissioners were in favour of raising up by the side of the Colleges an independent body which would bear witness to the distinct existence of the University, and excite the Colleges to greater exertion.³ The Cambridge Commissioners thought such a step both unnecessary and unwise.

To take the last of the five points—Religious Tests. The Commissioners say: “Beyond this line there lies another and a larger question on which we do not enter; namely, the expediency of admitting persons to Degrees in Arts and Law and Physic, who are not members of the Church of England. The subject would present comparatively few difficulties, if it involved only the conferring of a certificate and title of Academical proficiency. But the real difficulty lies in another point: whether the internal system of Collegiate discipline and the course of Academical administration could be so adjusted as to comprehend persons of different religious opinions without the neglect of religious ordinances, the compromise of religious consistency, or the disturbance of religious peace.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 143, 144.

² *Ib.* p. 144.

³ See above, p. 109.

“Not seeking to disguise our impression of the greatness of the difficulty, we yet desire to express our sense of the importance of the question itself.

“The University is a great national institution; invested with important privileges by the favour of the Crown or the authority of the Legislature. It exercises a most extensive influence on the education of the higher and middle classes of the community, and consequently on the intellectual, moral and social character of the nation. But its capacity of exercising this high prerogative fully and completely must depend on its keeping pace with the progress of enlightened opinion and moving in sympathy and unison with the spirit of the age. It is one of the noblest characteristics of our times that the barriers, which long excluded so many of our fellow subjects from the equal enjoyment of civil rights on account of differences in religious opinion, have happily been removed by the prevalence of a generous and wise policy. The University will be placed, more or less, in a false position, if it estranges itself from this great movement of liberal progress. There is a manifest and intelligible challenge to it to throw open the advantages of its system of education, under proper securities, as widely as the State has thrown open the avenues to civil rights and honours. Undoubtedly, many of the endowments of its Colleges are connected with the Church by links which it would be an injustice to sever. Its school of Theology is identified with the Church, and incapable of a separate existence. But, as a great school of liberal education for the lay professions, for the pursuits of general literature and science, for the business and offices of active public life, it should seem to be capable of a freer range and a more extended usefulness without any compromise of duty or apostacy of principle. Were it to enter on this more open course in a spirit of generous magnanimity, it might draw to itself a yet larger measure of public sympathy and even find increased safety in thus identifying itself with the liberal policy of the age.

“What securities should accompany such a concession to public opinion; what guarantees for internal peace can be provided either by regulations of the University or enactments of the Legislature; how much can be

made matter of compact, and how much must be left to mutual confidence between the University and any new classes of students whom it may eventually be induced to admit; these are questions on which we do not presume to express an opinion. We humbly leave them to the effect of time, to the wisdom of the Legislature, and to the gracious consideration of Your Majesty.”¹ From all which it is clear that the Cambridge Commissioners were in favour of the abolition of Tests, though they did not venture openly to recommend it.

The following were the recommendations as to the University Library:—

“That the privilege which the Copyright Act gives to the University might be advantageously commuted for a money payment to be expended in the purchase and binding of such works recently purchased as might be deemed to be worth preserving.”²

“That if additions should hereafter be made to the Library, it seems desirable that a Reading-room should be provided, where not only Undergraduates, but also other persons not members of the University, might be allowed to consult books under proper regulations.”³

The Commissioners, in concluding their Report, remark with approval on the reforms already made both by the University and the Colleges, and continue:—

“That the University was ready to enlarge its cycle of studies is proved by its instituting new Triposes of the Moral and Natural Sciences; and thus affording to most of the Professors an extended field of usefulness. A like spirit has been shown by the Colleges, which in several instances have, at a great cost and no small sacrifice of personal interests, enlarged their buildings, and in all cases shown themselves careful guardians of their corporate property, by foregoing a part of the income of the existing body with a view to the prospective benefit of the Society.

“Following rather than originating this opening source of amelioration, we have, in the foregoing Report, recommended a series of measures, in perfect harmony, as we conceive, with the spirit which has prompted these

¹ *Ib.* p. 44.

² *Ib.* p. 129.

³ *Ib.* p. 132.

beginnings, though in some respects going far beyond them. We have proposed the restoration in its integrity of the ancient supervision of the University over the studies of its Members, by the enlargement of the Professorial system—by the addition of such supplementary appliances to such system as may obviate the undue encroachments of that of private tuition—by opening avenues for acquiring Academical Honours in many new and distinct branches of knowledge and professional pursuit—by leaving to more aspiring students ample opportunity to devote themselves to those lines of acquirement in which natural bias has given them capacity, or in which the force of circumstances has rendered it urgent upon them to obtain pre-eminence; while not denying to the less highly gifted the social advantage of an University Degree. Still following the same lead, though here no doubt passing beyond the immediate limits marked out by internal reformatations, we have recommended the removal of all restrictions upon elections to Fellowships and Scholarships, and we have pointed out the means by which, without any real injury to the claims of particular Schools, all Fellowships and Scholarships may be placed on such a footing as to be brought universally under the one good rule of unfettered and open competition. In a like spirit we have regarded the existing distribution of Collegiate emoluments. We recognise the prevailing practice by which Fellowships are looked upon as just rewards of eminent merit, and as helps and encouragements to the further prosecution of study or general advancement in life. But, at the same time, bearing in mind that the Fellows of Colleges were by the original constitution of the University in the position of Teachers, and have laborious duties assigned to them arising out of the old scheme of Academical instruction, while in modern times the Fellowships are frequently held by Non-residents, and rarely contribute in any direct way to the course of Academical instruction, though their emoluments far exceed their original value, we have thought, that in consideration of this practical exemption from the performance of such educational duties, it is no more than reasonable and equitable in return that an adequate

contribution should be made from the Corporate Funds of the several Colleges towards rendering the course of Public Teaching, as carried on by the University itself, more efficient and complete.”¹

It will thus be seen that there are some striking differences between the Reports of the two sets of Commissioners. The Oxford Commissioners boldly face the fundamental question of the relation of the University to the Colleges. They pronounce for the ancient supremacy of the former over the latter, but the practical measures which they recommend proved entirely inadequate to achieve the end they had in view. The Cambridge Commissioners went on different lines. They do not touch so explicitly on the vexed question of University *v.* Colleges, nor do they exhibit the literary grace or the lucid arrangement of their colleagues. They make a great number of recommendations on all kinds of subjects both great and small,² and these are so mixed up together that the far-reaching nature of certain reforms which they advocate is in danger of being altogether overlooked.

Special attention may be called to begin with to the recommendation on p. 104 of the Report, already quoted and here repeated:—“That if the General Council of Studies comprised all the Professors, the Vice-Chancellor of the current and past year, the Public Orator, the Registrary, the two Proctors, the two Moderators, two Heads of Colleges appointed by their body, and eight members of the Senate appointed by the Colleges according to a cycle, a body would be formed which would be little likely to be influenced by the personal interests and feelings of any predominant class of its members to such an extent as seriously to compromise its usefulness and impartiality.” In the year 1852 there were already twenty-one Professors, and the Commissioners recommended the establishment of ten others.³ The composition, therefore, of the proposed

¹ pp. 202, 203.

² Cooper, in his *Annals of Cambridge*, Vol. V., pp. 75—89, summarises their recommendations under 127 heads. A few of these have to do with the relations between the University and the Town.

³ Report, p. 102.

General Council of Studies would have been mainly Professorial, that is to say, it would have looked at matters from the University standpoint. The Public Orator and the Registrary are two University officials, and it may be taken that they would have done the same. The two Heads and the eight members of the Senate appointed by the Colleges would naturally have taken the College point of view, while the Vice-Chancellors, the Proctors, and the Moderators, as discharging University functions, and yet very closely connected with the College system, might be thought likely to adopt an independent attitude. Sir William Hamilton himself would probably have been satisfied with this arrangement, as giving the University a preponderating voice in advising as to the best developments of study at Cambridge.

There is, too, an echo of the controversies sketched in the preceding pages in the sentence quoted from p. 70 of the Report: "That if the Professors are to continue to form useful and essential members of the University, their duties must be completely assimilated with its system, and be modified therefore from time to time to suit the changes which it undergoes; and that it is chiefly owing to the want of necessary readjustments to the varying circumstances of the University that some of them have lost their proper influence in its public teaching." The Commissioners here recognise the disrepute into which Professorial or University teaching had fallen, and suggest a method of improving it.

Most daring of all is the suggestion (p. 82) that the Colleges should only be responsible for the instruction of the Undergraduates up to the time of their passing the Previous Examination, *i.e.* normally to their fifth term, and that all the instruction for Degrees should be handed over to the Professoriate, the fees for tuition being divided in a proportion to be agreed on.¹ This plan would have put all the tuition that ought properly to be done at a University into the hands of the University teachers, leaving only the belated school teaching to the Colleges. The University staff of teachers, which was to be greatly

¹ This recommendation appears to be a modification of the scheme proposed by Mr. Bonamy Price at Oxford in 1850, and set out in Chapter V. of this book.

enlarged, was also to be subsidised from College funds. Two principles are here involved: (1) that the University should have the ultimate control of the teaching; and (2) that they should so far control the College finances as to be able to draw from them the funds necessary to support the increased University staff. These principles have never yet been fully acted on; they were lost sight of for many years, but they will one day be considered on their merits.

CHAPTER VII.

THE UNIVERSITY ACTS OF 1854 AND 1856.

It will be remembered that it was Lord John Russell, who, as the head of Her Majesty's Government, advised the issue of the Royal Commission in 1850. In 1852, when the Commission reported, the Earl of Derby was Prime Minister, and in the Queen's Speech of November in that year there appeared a paragraph stating that the Universities had been asked to consider the recommendations of the Reports. Shortly after, the Derby Administration was defeated in the House of Commons, and the Earl of Aberdeen became Prime Minister, with Mr. Gladstone as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Palmerston as Home Secretary. No definite step was taken till December 12th, 1853, when Lord Palmerston sent a letter to the Chancellors of the two Universities couched in the following terms:—

“SIR,—Her Majesty's Government have had before them the Letter addressed by my predecessor on the 4th of October, 1852, to the Chancellor of the University of

Oxford	}	:
Cambridge		

”

“A statement was made to the House of Commons (subsequent to the Queen's Speech on the 11th of November, 1852, which stated that copies of the Commissioners' Report had been sent to the two Universities) that the Government thought it desirable that ample time should be allowed for a full examination of these matters, and that it was not intended that any legislation on the subject should be proposed to Parliament during the then current session.

“At the same time, though it was not deemed expedient to discuss details, yet reference was made to some essential points with respect to which Her Majesty's Government conceived that it would be the desire of Parliament that plans of improvement should be entertained.

“These points were :—

“1. An alteration of the constitution of the Universities, with a view to the more general and effective representation of the several main elements which properly enter into their composition.

“2. The adoption of measures which might enable the Universities, without weakening the proper securities for discipline, to extend the benefits of training to a greater number of students, whether in connexion or not with Colleges and Halls, and also to diminish the relative disadvantages which now attach within Colleges and Halls to students of comparatively limited pecuniary means.

“3. The establishment of such rules with regard to Fellowships, and to the enjoyment of other College endowments, as might wholly abolish or greatly modify the restrictions which now, in many cases, attach to those Fellowships and endowments, and might subject the acquisition of such Fellowships and endowments generally to the effective influence of competition.

“4. The establishment of such regulations with regard to Fellowships thus to be acquired by merit as should prevent them from degenerating into sinecures, and especially the enactment of a provision, that after Fellowships should have been held for such a time as might be thought reasonable as rewards for early exertion and distinction, they should either be relinquished, or should only continue to be held on condition of residence, coupled with a discharge of active duty in discipline or tuition, or with the earnest prosecution of private study.

“5. And, lastly, the establishment of provisions under which Colleges possessed of means either particularly ample, or now only partially applied to the purposes of education or learning, might, in conformity with the views which founders have often indicated, render some portion of their property available for the general purposes of the University beyond as well as within the College walls, and might thus facilitate the energetic prosecution of some branches of study, the importance of which the Universities have of late distinctly and specially acknowledged.”

Lord Palmerston therefore requested the Chancellor “to take an early opportunity of informing him what

measures of improvement the University or any of the Colleges therein may be about to undertake, and what aid they may desire from Parliament in the form either of prohibitions, of enabling powers, or of new enactments."

On January 13th, 1854, the Syndicate appointed by the University of Cambridge to consider Lord Palmerston's letter reported, and their report was unanimously accepted four days later. The main points in it were as follows:—

1. It called attention to the labours of the Syndicate appointed to revise the Statutes of the University on March 7th, 1849 (or more than twelve months before the announcement of the Royal Commission), and its scheme for the reform of the Senate which was accepted by the Commissioners.

2. It rejected the proposal to create Non-Collegiate students but agreed with the erection of hostels in connexion with or in dependence on the Colleges, adding that "where Colleges do not possess the means of building, the purpose of providing accommodation for a greater number of their Students might be effected, if occasion required, by hiring houses in the town."

3. As regards Professorial and other University foundations the Syndicate submitted "that the object in view might be accomplished if enabling powers, to be exercised for a limited time, were given by an Act of the Legislature to a Board of persons who should deserve the confidence of the University and the country."

The other points raised in Lord Palmerston's letter were not dealt with because they concerned the Colleges and not the University.

Mr. Gladstone had by this time shaken off the Toryism which had impelled him in 1850 to oppose the appointment of the Royal Commission, and the duty fell on him as Member for Oxford University to frame the Oxford Bill on behalf of the Government. The Crimean War was then imminent and broke out in February, 1854. Mr. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, had to provide the money wherewith to carry it on, a sufficiently arduous task one would have imagined, but his heart was not in the war, but in the cause of educational reform.

Lord Morley thus writes of him¹: "In none of the enterprises of his life was he more industrious or energetic. Before December he forwarded to Lord John Russell what he called a rude draft, but the rude draft contained the kernel of the plan that was ultimately carried, with a suggestion even of the names of the Commissioners to whom operations were to be confided. . . . As he began, so he advanced, listening to everybody, arguing with everybody, flexible, persistent, clear, practical, fervid, unconquerable. . . . 'My whole heart is in the Oxford Bill,' he writes (March 29), 'it is my consolation under the pain with which I view the character my office is assuming under the circumstances of war.' 'Gladstone has been surprising everybody here,' writes a conspicuous High Churchman from Oxford, 'by the ubiquity of his correspondence. Three-fourths of the Colleges have been in communication with him, on various parts of the Bill more or less affecting themselves. He answers everybody by return of post, fully and at length, quite entering into their case and showing the greatest acquaintance with it.' . . . What he saw was that if this Bill was thrown out, no other half so favourable would ever again be brought in.

"The scheme accepted by the Cabinet was in essentials Mr. Gladstone's own. Jowett at the earliest stage sent him a comprehensive plan, and soon after, saw Lord John (Jan. 6). 'I must own,' writes the latter to Mr. Gladstone, 'I was much struck by the clearness and completeness of his views.' The difference between Jowett's plan and Mr. Gladstone's was on the highly important point of machinery. Jowett, who all his life had a weakness for getting and keeping authority into his own hands, or the hands of those he could influence, contended that after Parliament had settled principles, Oxford itself could be trusted to settle details far better than a little body of great personages from outside, unacquainted with special wants and special interests. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, invented the idea of an Executive Commission with statutory powers. The two plans were printed and circulated, and the balance of opinion in the Cabinet went

¹ *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 500.

decisively for Mr. Gladstone's scheme. . . In drawing the clauses Mr. Gladstone received the help of Bethell, the Solicitor-General, at whose suggestion Phillimore and Thring were called in for further aid in what was undoubtedly a task of exceptional difficulty. The process brought into clearer light the truth discerned by Mr. Gladstone from the first, that the enormous number of diverse institutions that had grown up at Oxford made resort to what he called sub-legislation inevitable; that is to say, they were too complex for Parliament, and could only be dealt with by delegation to executive act. . .

"Oxford, scene of so many agitations for a score of years past, was once more seized with consternation, stupefaction, enthusiasm. A few private copies of the draft were sent down from London for criticism. On the Vice-Chancellor it left 'an impression of sorrow and sad anticipations'; it opened deplorable prospects for the University, the Church, for religion, for righteousness. The Dean of Christ Church thought it not merely inexpedient, but unjust and tyrannical. Jowett, on the other hand, was convinced that it must satisfy all reasonable reformers, and added emphatically in writing to Mr. Gladstone, 'It is to yourself and Lord John that the University will be indebted for the greatest boon that it has ever received.' After the introduction of the Bill the obscurantists made a final effort to call down one of their old pelting hailstorms. A petition against the Bill was submitted to Convocation; happily it passed by a majority of no more than two."

There is only one point in the above account which seems to call for criticism—the invention by Mr. Gladstone of the idea of an Executive Commission with statutory powers. As has already been pointed out in Chapter VI., the Cambridge Commissioners had written: "If Parliament should entertain the question of the reform of the University and its Colleges, it seems to us that it would be convenient to lay down, in an Act of the Legislature, the principles upon which such reforms should be conducted, and to entrust a Board with temporary powers necessary for carrying them into effect. . . The result of the deliberations of such a Board as we have ventured to suggest, might properly be referred to Your Majesty in

Council for final sanction.”¹ The Report of the Cambridge Syndicate, already quoted in this chapter, endorses this suggestion of the Commissioners, and it was the plan followed in 1854, 1856 and 1877. Mr. Gladstone’s reputation will not be injured by so small a subtraction from the sum total of his achievements.

Though Mr. Gladstone had framed the Bill he was not put in charge of it. It was Lord John Russell who on March 17th, 1854, rose in the House of Commons to move for leave to bring in a Bill to make further provision for the good government of the University of Oxford and of the Colleges therein.² He asked for indulgence on the ground that not having had the honour of studying there, he had not any personal acquaintance with the institutions of the University of Oxford, but he showed in his speech a complete grasp of the situation. The plan of the Bill was to take in order the points raised in Lord Palmerston’s letter to the two Chancellors. In the first place came the necessary alterations in the constitution of the University, but the Government proposals were reserved till later on in his remarks. The next question was the extension of the University, and here Lord John Russell dropped into history. “We find,” he said, “in ancient times that the University, and not the Colleges, was the principal ruling body—that the Congregation of the leading resident Tutors, and Professors, summoned by bell, formed the ruling body of the University—that at one time there were no less than 300 Halls, to which scholars resorted to obtain the benefit of the education of the University. But in progress of time the whole of this system was subverted, and the Commissioners state that for 150 years—it appears, however, for a considerably longer period—the Halls have entirely disappeared, and no instruction has been given except under the modern system, through the medium of the Tutors of the different Colleges. There is, then, quite a different system from that which was originally established; and the consequence of that different system is, that the education has become far more confined—that young

¹ Report, pp. 199, 200.

² For this and the subsequent debates see Hansard, *Parliamentary Reports*, Vol. CXXXI., p. 892 and onwards.

men are obliged to enter themselves of a College, they are obliged to receive the education given in that College, and they look only to that education as the means of obtaining whether degrees or honours, or whether Fellowships and the more substantial rewards of the University."

Here the speaker, naturally enough, glided off into a discussion of the then burning topic,—education in Colleges by Tutors, and education in the University by Professors. After reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of both methods, he states his own conclusion: "I own it appears to me, Sir, that we have an opportunity, and an opportunity which we ought not to lose, to combine the advantage of Tutorial College tuition with that of Professorial teaching." He then read to the House a statement of the number of pupils who had attended the lectures of the several University Professors during the last two years, and continued: "Thus it will be perceived, in regard to all these Professorships, that they do not form, in fact, a part of the education of the University; and therefore, when it is stated, as it is, in some of the works that have been issued against the Report of the Commissioners, that there are at present Professors, the obvious answer is, that no doubt there are at present Professors, but that attendance on their lectures does not form any part of the road to honours or emoluments in the University, and that the consequence is, as might naturally be expected, that the studies of the Colleges are preferred. . . It is clear, therefore, that the time has come when there ought to be a junction between the system of teaching in the Colleges and the duties of the University Professors."

Lord John Russell next turned to the question of the cost of a University course, reminding the House that "the only means of obtaining education is by becoming an inmate of one of the Colleges. . . The consequence, then, of the Colleges having this monopoly, and of the restrictions established in consequence of the Laudian Statutes, has been that those cheaper modes of living which were in use in former times, and by which great numbers of persons, otherwise poor, could obtain entrance into the University, all these avenues are

shut up, and the numbers at the University have been very much reduced. This, therefore, is one of the defects for which we wish to provide a remedy—that there is no means of obtaining education at Oxford except by belonging to one of the Colleges.

“The next point to which I wish to refer,” continued the speaker, “is the restrictions which are placed upon the various emoluments, which are the rewards of learning in the University. It is part of the same subject that many of these Fellowships are held by those who for many years have had no connection with Oxford, nor contributed in any way to the studies of the place, and thereby the means of this great University are restricted and frittered away. . .

“It appears to me that some part at least of the revenues of the richer Colleges—that some part of those revenues which are not now applied to the purposes of learning and the purposes of teaching in the Universities, ought to be so applied; and that we could not do better than lay down certain rules by which Professors and Lecturers, and others engaged in teaching in the University, might receive a sufficient income and be made available for the future purposes of University education.”

Lord John Russell then turned from this enunciation of general principles to the actual text of the proposed measure. “What we propose in the first place is that instead of the Hebdomadal Board consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, the Proctors and twenty-three Heads of Houses, there shall be a body composed of twenty-four or twenty-five members, to be called the Hebdomadal Council, and to be composed in the following manner. We propose that the Vice-Chancellor and the two Proctors shall always form part of this Council, and that when the Vice-Chancellor for the preceding year shall not be an elected member he shall also form part of the Council. That will give three or four persons who will be members *ex-officio*. With respect to the others, we begin by forming a body, to be called, according to the ancient name, a ‘Congregation,’ and which will, in fact, consist of all the resident teaching staff of the University. There will belong to that body, called a Congregation, all the Heads of Houses, the Tutors of Colleges, the Professors, persons

bearing certain offices in the University, and others who are resident, upon certain conditions, and fulfilling certain rules which will be laid down. This body will therefore be numerous, and we propose that of the remaining twenty-one members of the Hebdomadal Council, seven shall be Heads of Houses, of whom six shall be chosen by the Congregation and one nominated by the Chancellor of the University. To these seven there will be added eight Professors, of whom the Congregation will choose six, the Chancellor will nominate one, and the eighth will be one of the Divinity Professors of the University. There will then remain six, who will be chosen out of the resident members of Congregation by the Congregation. This we propose as the governing body of the University.

“The next subject is one of which I have already stated to you the effect—I mean the exclusive character of College education.¹ I propose that there should be a power to open private halls, which may be opened by any Master of Arts obtaining a licence from the Vice-Chancellor for that purpose. The Commissioners proposed that undergraduates should be permitted to live in lodgings under certain restrictions; but, upon considering the matter, we think it a safer plan that those who are not in Colleges shall be in private halls, where they will be subject to some discipline, but where at the same time they will have a more economical mode of living than is to be obtained at present.

“I now come to the question of preferences granted to those who come under one of these different denominations—that they are related to the founder; that they come from a particular place or county; or, lastly, that they have belonged to a particular school. . . . We propose to do away with the restrictions with respect to founders’ kindred and to particular localities—except with respect to those which have been founded within 100 years, and with respect to the lineal descendants of the founder. With respect to schools, we only provide in the cases of their claims to Fellowships that there must in

¹ As Mr. Walpole pointed out in the debate, whereas at Oxford undergraduates had for the most part to reside in the Colleges, in Cambridge very great numbers resided in lodgings. *Hansard*, Vol. CXXXI., p. 917.

every instance be at least two scholars from whom to choose. . .

“I come now to state the powers which we propose to give of applying part of the revenues of the Colleges for the purpose of increasing the funds for education in the University; and in order that each College may have time to consider its Statutes very carefully, we propose that there should be for a certain limited time a Commission of five persons, who shall have the powers I now propose to state. In the first place, we propose that they should have the power of approving Statutes in conformity with the proposals of this Bill, and that after Michaelmas Term, 1855, if the University and the Colleges are held not to have performed that which is expected of them—that then the Commissioners shall have power to enact by Statute, rules in accordance with this Act, which rules when they have been laid before the Privy Council, have been approved by Her Majesty, and have for a certain period been placed upon the table of this House, shall have the force of law and be binding, as Statutes, on the University and the Colleges. Such being the constitution of the Commission, it is proposed that each of the Colleges shall have the power of contributing from its annual revenue one-fifth part towards the foundation or better endowment of Professorships or Lectureships; to provide for the discharge of the duties thereof; to diminish the number of Fellowships belonging to such College, or suspend payment of the emoluments of any such Fellowships, with a view to the foundation of such Professorships or Lectureships; or to the supply of pensions on the retirement therefrom of the Professors or Lecturers; or to the foundation of Scholarships in the College; or to the raising the income of the remaining Fellowships to any sum not exceeding £250 a year; or to the erection of new buildings; or to the establishment of Halls, to be affiliated to such College, and the acquisition of grounds and buildings for the same; and that they may appropriate any number, not exceeding one-fourth, of the Fellowships belonging to any College to the encouragement of the special studies of the schools of Mathematics, Natural Science, or Modern History, or of any other studies recognised or to be recognised by the University.”

Lord John Russell finished his speech with the following reference to University tests :—

“ Sir, there remains one question on which there is no provision in this Bill, but on which I shall at any time be prepared to give my vote in conformity with the opinion I have always held. I cannot think that the whole purposes of the University are fulfilled while there is a test at the entrance of the University which hinders so many persons from entering it at all. But I do expect certainly that by the addition of those new Halls there will be facilities which may induce Parliament not much longer to interpose the obstructions which hitherto have been interposed, to the enjoyment of the benefits of those great schools by a far larger portion of Her Majesty’s subjects than at present enjoy them. But though this is my opinion, I do not think it would have been wise in Her Majesty’s Government to have decided on placing any proposition of the kind in the present Bill. It is a subject which I think should be reserved for a separate measure and a separate consideration.”

Mr. Miall, the Nonconformist leader, could not conceal his disappointment with this announcement. He said: “ According to the late Census as to religious worship in England, it would appear that this country, religiously speaking, might be divided into three parts. There were above 5,000,000 absenters, about 5,000,000 Dissenters, and above 5,000,000 members of the Establishment; three tolerably equal divisions. The national institutions of Oxford and Cambridge were to be improved and continued for the special and exclusive advantage of the one-third part of the people of these realms.” Mr. Heywood followed in the same sense, and gave notice of his intention to move in Committee a clause opening the Universities to Dissenters. The Opposition fastened mainly on the proposal that the Colleges should contribute out of their revenues to University purposes. Leave was then given, and the Bill was brought in and read a first time.

On April 7th the Bill was read a second time without a division. Lord Morley thus describes the scene: “ At length the blessed day of the second reading came. The ever-zealous Arthur Stanley was present. ‘ A superb

speech from Gladstone,' he records, 'in which, for the first time, all the arguments from our Report were worked up in the most effective manner. He vainly endeavoured to reconcile his present with his former position. But with this exception, I listened to his speech with the greatest delight. To behold one's old enemies slaughtered before one's face with the most irresistible weapons was quite intoxicating. One great charm of his speaking is its exceeding good-humour. There is great vehemence, but no bitterness.'"¹

On April 27th, the motion having been made, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," Mr. Heywood moved as an amendment that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. He pointed out that in connexion with Fellowships two things were left untouched—compulsory ordination, and enforced celibacy. Mr. Disraeli supported him (not without a desire, it may be imagined, of getting rid of the Bill altogether), and so did Mr. John Bright, on the ground of the exclusion of the Dissenters. The amendment was rejected by 172 to 90.

The temper of the House was clearly shown as soon as it got into Committee. The clauses appointing the Commissioners and defining their powers were passed with but little difficulty.² But trouble began on Clause 6, which related to the composition of the Hebdomadal Council. Mr. Walpole was in favour of what was called sectional election, *i.e.* that the Heads of Colleges should elect the Heads to serve on the Council, and that the Professors should elect the Professors, and proposed amendments to that effect. The amendment as to the Heads was carried against the Government by 162 to 149, and the Government did not resist a similar motion about the Professors.

The next serious amendment was on Clause 18, which dealt with the way in which the new body, Congregation, was to be made up. The Bill proposed that it should consist of the following persons, among others:—

"The Tutors of Colleges and Halls and other officers

¹ *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. I., p. 503.

² The Commissioners first proposed by the Government were the Earl of Ellesmere, the Bishop of Ripon, Sir J. T. Coleridge, the Dean of Wells, and Sir J. W. Awdry. Two were subsequently added—the Earl of Harrowby and Mr. George Cornwall Lewis. Mr. Goldwin Smith and the Rev. Mr. Wayte were appointed Secretaries.

engaged in the discipline of Colleges; all Masters of Private Halls; all Residents who, though not actually holding any of the aforesaid qualifications, may have held one or more of them at any previous time for three years and upwards; and Residents qualified in respect of study under this Act."

This was a mild attempt to confine Congregation to the real workers and students at the University. Sir William Heathcote moved as an amendment that all these words be left out and the words "all residents" be substituted for them. He argued that if Congregation was to be useful at all, "it ought to be an epitome and a representation of Convocation (*i.e.* the whole body of graduates, resident and non-resident), and ought to have in it as many elements of Convocation as possible. His amendment would include the parochial clergy in Oxford, who would form a most desirable body of representatives for the clergy throughout the kingdom, and it would also admit the private Tutors, who, as matters stood at present, had no place in Congregation." The Government view, as expressed by Mr. Gladstone, was that "Congregation should represent the intellect and aristocracy of the University, and include within it the whole studying and the whole teaching body of the University." On a division Sir William Heathcote's amendment was carried against the Government by 135 to 104.

Lord Morley remarks on these proceedings: "In Parliament the craft laboured heavily in cross-seas. 'I have never known,' says its pilot, 'a measure so foolishly discussed in Committee.' Nor was oil cast upon the waters by its friends. By the end of May Mr. Gladstone and Lord John saw that they must take in canvas. Accordingly on June 1st, Lord John Russell announced that the Government proposed to introduce clauses giving the Commissioners power to make Statutes for the Colleges under certain conditions, and to omit sixteen clauses of very great detail. What could not be got through Parliament in the way of reform was thus relegated to an outside but statutory body to deal with.¹

¹ The most interesting thing omitted was the sub-section giving power to the Colleges to contribute from their annual revenues any sum not exceeding one-fifth part to the foundation or better endowment of Professorships and Lectureships in the University.

The Bill was then discussed *de novo* in Committee, beginning on June 15th. Mr. Heywood, on the Report stage, moved a new clause providing that from the first day of Michaelmas Term, 1854, it should not be necessary for any person, upon matriculation at the University of Oxford, to make or subscribe any declaration or take any oath except the oath of allegiance or an equivalent declaration, the object of the clause being to place Oxford on the same footing in this respect as Cambridge. At Oxford, students at matriculation had to sign the Thirty-nine Articles and take the Oath of Supremacy. Dissenters were thus effectually excluded. The clause was read a second time by 252 to 161. Mr. Heywood then moved a second clause abolishing the religious test on taking any of the degrees in Arts, Law, or Medicine, but this clause was negatived by 205 to 196. He moved it again on the third reading, when it was carried by 223 to 79.

The second reading of the Bill came on in the House of Lords on July 6th, and was moved by Viscount Canning. It was agreed to without a division. In Committee things did not go quite so smoothly. There was a notable outburst by the Earl of Winchelsea, who on Clauses 31 and 34, which dealt with close Fellowships and Scholarships, said that "the present Bill proposed to effect the most dreadful confiscation of property that ever took place in an enlightened country, and was the grossest violation of justice that ever characterised the Legislature of England. There never was a measure so fraught with evil, so unjust in principle, so iniquitous in its details, as this accursed Bill." But the noble Earl was only a private member. There was no official opposition, and after the two Houses had agreed on certain amendments, the Bill received the Royal Assent on August 7th.

The following are the principal provisions of the Act as actually passed, and they will enable the reader to follow the final results of amendments and counter-amendments in the two Chambers:—

The Preamble runs:—"Whereas it is expedient for the Advancement of Religion and Learning, to enlarge the Powers of making and altering Statutes and Regulations

now possessed by the University of *Oxford* and the Colleges thereof, and to make and enable to be made further Provision for the Government, and for the Extension of the said University, and for the Abrogation of Oaths now taken therein, and otherwise for maintaining and improving the Discipline and Studies and the good government of the said University of Oxford and the Colleges thereof; Be it enacted," etc.

It will be observed that nothing is said here about the power given to the Colleges to contribute out of their funds to University purposes. This is tucked away in the Preamble to Clause 27.

After appointing Commissioners and defining their powers, the Act sets up a Hebdomadal Council in lieu of the old Hebdomadal Board and frames its composition thus:—"The Hebdomadal Council shall consist of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Proctors, Six Heads of Colleges or Halls, Six Professors of the University, and Six Members of Convocation of not less than Five Years Standing, such Heads of Colleges or Halls, Professors, and Members of Convocation to be elected by the Congregation hereinafter mentioned of the said University, and the Chancellor, or in his absence the Vice-Chancellor, or his Deputy, being a Member of the Hebdomadal Council, shall be the President of such Hebdomadal Council." Twenty-four weeks residence during Term time was made necessary for continuing to hold a seat on the Council. The Vice-Chancellor was instructed to make a Register of Congregation, and regulations respecting the Hebdomadal Council. "Sectional election" had been in the end defeated.

Clause 16 defines the composition of Congregation: "The Congregation of the University shall be composed of the following persons only, the said Persons being Members of Convocation:—

1. The Chancellor.
2. The High Steward.
3. The Heads of Colleges and Halls.
4. The Canons of Christ Church.
5. The Proctors.
6. The Members of the Hebdomadal Council.
7. The Officers named in Schedule A to this Act annexed.

8. The Professors.
9. Assistant or Deputy Professors.
10. The Public Examiners.
11. All Residents.
12. All such Persons as shall be provided to be added by Election or otherwise to the said Congregation by any Statute of the University approved by the Commissioners, or (after the Expiry of the Commission) passed by Licence of the Crown."

Schedule A included:—

"Deputy Steward.

Public Orator.

Keeper of the Archives.

Assessor of the Vice-Chancellor's Court.

Registrar of the University.

Counsel to the University.

Bodley's Librarian.

Radcliffe Librarian.

Radcliffe Observer.

Librarians and Sub-Librarians of
University Libraries.

Keepers of University Museums and Re- positories of Arts or Science.	}	If authorised for the Purposes of the Sche- dule by Statute of the University."
---	---	--

The inclusion of "All Residents," according to the amendment moved by Sir William Heathcote, was the most serious alteration made in the Committee stage. Mark Pattison thus writes of it:—"Congregation was called into being by the Act of 1854, and was calculated to have been one of the most useful of its enactments. That it has not been so is owing to an alteration, seemingly trifling, which was made in the Bill in Committee. Congregation was designed by Mr. Gladstone to be an assembly of the persons engaged in teaching—a *Senatus Academicus*. In Committee this was enlarged to include all residents. This alteration added to the assembly about 100 members, not connected with the studies of the place, and waterlogged Congregation at one stroke. Had Mr. Gladstone's first draft been adopted,

Congregation would have been a revival of the old distinction between Regent and Non-regent Masters. It would have been a notable example of what I believe will be found to be true, that, as the University revives, we shall find ourselves reviving old arrangements, not because they are old, but because they are the results of much experience.”¹

Every Statute framed by the Council was to be proposed first to Congregation and then, after a fixed interval, submitted to Convocation for final adoption or rejection. (Clause 17.)

Members of Congregation were given the power of proposing amendments in writing to any Statute promulgated by the Council, “which the said Council shall consider, and thereupon may adopt, alter, or reject. They were also given the power of speaking thereon in the *English Tongue*, but without the Power of moving any Amendment.” (Clauses 18 and 20.) It is curious that an Act of Parliament was necessary to restore to Oxford graduates the right of using their own mother tongue, but Oxford is still strangely mediæval in the way in which it sticks to Latin.

The question of reducing the cost of a University course was one of the subjects most discussed in the debates of both Houses, and it resulted in Clauses 25-27 of the Act. Clause 25 provides that “It shall be lawful for any Member of Convocation, of such Standing and Qualifications as may be provided by any Statute hereafter to be made, to obtain a Licence from the Vice-Chancellor to open his Residence, if situate within one mile and a half of *Carfax*, for the Reception of Students, who shall be matriculated and admitted to all the Privileges of the University without being of necessity entered as Members of any Colleges or existing Hall.” These persons were to be called Licensed Masters and their residences Private Halls. The University was further authorised to make Statutes for the regulation of these Private Halls, including their aggregation into one or more Great Halls of the University.

These clauses are a memorable example of how even the wisest men may be deceived in their expectations of

¹ *Suggestions on Academical Organisation*, p. 29.

the good results which are to follow from a particular reform. Sir William Hamilton had been a strong advocate of these Halls; the Cambridge Commissioners made them a special feature in their Report; Mr. Gladstone was eager for the proposed right to establish private halls, as a change calculated to extend the numbers and strength of the University, and as settling the much-disputed question, whether the scale of living could not be reduced, and University education brought within reach of classes of moderate means. The plan in question has proved a failure.

Clause 28 gives the Colleges power to alter their Statutes with respect to eligibility to Headships, Fellowships, and other College emoluments, and for that purpose to modify or abolish any Preference, and in the case of some of the Colleges for rendering portions of their Property available to purposes for the benefit of the University, and for the conversion of Fellowships attached to Schools into Scholarships or Exhibitions so attached, subject to the approval of the Commissioners; the said Commissioners being empowered to take action themselves provided the Colleges failed to do so. The University was also empowered to alter Trusts which had been in existence more than fifty years (Clause 30).

The duty of the Colleges to help the University was further emphasised by Clause 38:—"In giving effect to their Powers with respect to the Colleges and Halls, the Commissioners shall have regard, among other things, to making due Provision, firstly, for the Wants and Improvements of the College or Hall, and the Advancement of Religion and Learning among its own members; and secondly, for aid towards the Establishment of the Professoriate of the said University on an enlarged basis in the several main Branches of Science and Letters, and with adequate Duties and Emoluments, by appropriating Portions of the divisible Revenues of any College for that Purpose, in Cases where the Founder of the College hath directed Lectures to be delivered for the Benefit of the University, or where it shall appear to the Commissioners that the College is well able to make such Provision."

Lord John Russell, in his speech on moving for leave

to bring in the Bill, had mentioned one-fifth part or 20 per cent. of the corporate revenue as the limit up to which a College might be allowed to contribute voluntarily to University purposes. There is no such percentage in the Act, the question of contribution being one of those things which were left to the Commissioners. Here again the Act failed. The Colleges did not provide for the needs of the Universities, and the matter was not even partially settled till the supplementary legislation of 1877.

Clauses 43 and 44 abolished religious tests for Matriculation and the Bachelor's Degree, but not for the Master's or its equivalent Degree, or the higher Degrees. The indirect effect of their retention in these latter cases was that no Nonconformist could be a member of the Hebdomadal Council, or of Congregation, or of Convocation. He remained entirely shut out from all participation in the government of the University.

The Cambridge University Bill had a far less stormy passage through Parliament than the corresponding measure for the University of Oxford, doubtless because it followed the lines which had already been agreed on. It was introduced into the House of Lords in 1855 and subsequently went down to the House of Commons, but at so late a period of the Session that it could not be proceeded with. It was reintroduced in the House of Commons in 1856 and passed its first and second readings without discussion. The general discussion took place on May 30th, on the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair. The altered importance of the occasion was shown by the fact that it was not the Prime Minister, but a subordinate member of the Government, Mr. Bouverie, who stated the official case. He criticised the University of Cambridge in strong terms. "The proposition he would lay down to justify the interference of Parliament was this—that the University of Cambridge and the Colleges were institutions having a vast revenue, and enormous means for the education of the people, and that those resources were not turned to the best account; but that on the contrary the result produced was comparatively very small."¹ The Commis-

¹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Reports*, Vol. CXLII., p. 809.

sioners of 1852 estimated the income of the 17 Colleges at not less than £185,000 a year. The income of the University was £24,500, making a total of £209,500. Yet it appeared from the Commission Report that in the eleven years from 1840 to 1850 inclusive the average number of persons taking the B.A. degree was only 336. Taking the thirteen years beginning in 1620 and ending in 1632, before the civil troubles began, the average number of B.A. degrees was 293. Practically the educational result had not increased, though the population had meanwhile increased from 300 to 400 per cent. It followed that the cost of each B.A. degree was between £600 and £700, or about £200 a year, independently of what each student paid out of his own pocket. Mr. Bouverie poured the greatest scorn on the Pass degree and detailed to the House the subjects required in the Previous and General Examinations, declaring that any intelligent boy of sixteen could prepare himself for them in six weeks time. Cambridge University education was equally defective as regards the three professions of Theology, Law and Medicine. He did not blame the University, because it had small power of self-improvement. It was troubled with an antiquated and confined constitution. The Bill proposed that a body to be elected by the resident members of the University should have the power of initiating measures. To that body he proposed to intrust, not only these legislative functions, but also the power of framing Statutes for amending or repealing the University Statutes, the code of Whitgift, or any other Royal Statutes in existence, together with a general power of imposing and altering bye-laws. The oaths of the University also demanded great alteration. "The Universities were formerly national institutions, practically open to all the nation, but now, by the system of oaths and tests which had sprung up, half the public, the Dissenters, were excluded from University degrees, and this not by any Act of Parliament, but in consequence of a letter of James I., never formally recognised, although acted on by the University, in which he required all who took degrees to subscribe to the Articles of the Church of England as well as to take the Oath of Supremacy." It was proposed by the present Bill that

none of these oaths or declarations should be required upon taking degrees.

In Committee, Mr. Heywood moved the following clause:—"From and after the first day of Michaelmas Term 1856, it shall not be necessary for any person on obtaining any Exhibition, Scholarship, or other College Emolument available for the assistance of an Undergraduate Student in his Academical Education, to make or subscribe any Declaration of his Religious Opinion or Belief, or to take any oath, any Law or Statute to the contrary notwithstanding."

This was added to the Bill.

He was also successful in amending Clause 44 so that Dissenters besides being admitted to take degrees could also become members of the Senate. The vote was 85 in favour to 60 against.

In the House of Lords the Bill was also read a first and second time without discussion. In Committee Lord Lyndhurst carried an amendment negating Mr. Heywood's amendment to Clause 44 on the ground that "it was a most important thing to take care that those who governed the University should be members of the Church of England." The voting was Content 73; Not Content 26; Majority 47. The two Houses soon came to an agreement on the points of difference between them, and the Royal Assent was given to the Act on July 29th.

The Commissioners appointed for the purposes of the Act were the Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. John Lonsdale, formerly Fellow of King's College), the Bishop of Chester (Dr. John Graham, sometime Master of Christ's College), Lord Stanley, the Right Hon. M. T. Baines, Vice-Chancellor Sir William Page Wood, the Right Hon. Sir Lawrence Peel, the Dean of Ely (Dr. George Peacock), and the Rev. Dr. C. J. Vaughan. The powers conferred on them were to remain in force till January 1st, 1859, with power of extension till January 1st, 1860, but no longer.

The chief operative Clauses of the Act may here be set out.

Clauses 5 and 6 abolished the old *Caput Senatus* and established the present Council in its stead. The

Caput accordingly came to an end on November 6th, 1856, and on November 7th there was elected a Council consisting of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, four Masters of Colleges, four Professors, and eight other members of the Senate, with not more than two members of the same College among the eight.

Clause 7 sets up the Electoral Roll, the body corresponding to Congregation at Oxford. It consists of the members of the Senate (the equivalent of Oxford Convocation) who have resided for fourteen weeks at least of the academical year within a mile and a half of Great St. Mary's Church, together with all officers of the University, being members of the Senate, the Heads of Houses, the Professors, and the Public Examiners. The Electoral Roll thus includes "all residents," as did Congregation at Oxford.

The office of Vice-Chancellor was continued to the Heads of Colleges exclusively, two Heads having always to be nominated by the Council of the Senate, of whom the Senate elects one (Clause 21).

By Clause 22 the oaths which had so troubled the mind of Sir William Hamilton were finally got rid of. It enacted that every oath directly or indirectly binding the Juror—

Not to disclose any matter or thing relating to his College, although required so to do by lawful authority;

To resist or not to concur in any change in the Statutes of the University or Colleges;

To do or forbear from doing anything the doing or the not doing of which would tend to any such concealment, resistance, or non-concurrence,

shall from the time of the passing of this Act be an illegal oath in the said University and the Colleges thereof, and no such oath shall hereafter be administered or taken.

Objection was taken to many proposals in the Oxford and Cambridge Bills, but no objection was taken to this clause or the corresponding clause in the Act of 1854. Sir William Hamilton's oft-repeated accusations of perjury had done their work, and all parties agreed to bury the offending promises out of sight as speedily and quietly as possible.

By Clause 23 any member of the University of such standing and qualifications as were to be hereafter provided by statute, may obtain a licence from the Vice-Chancellor to open his residence, if situate within one mile and a half from Great St. Mary's Church, for the reception of students who shall be matriculated and admitted to all the privileges of the University without being of necessity admitted as members of any College.

By Clause 27 the Colleges were given power to frame new Statutes any time before January 1st, 1858, specially with reference to

(i.) the Headship, Fellowships and emoluments "so as to insure such Fellowships and emoluments being conferred according to personal merits and fitness, and being retained for such periods as are likely to conduce to the better advancement of the interests of religion and learning":

(ii.) the altering and abolition of oaths:

(iii.) redistributing or apportioning the divisible revenues of the College: --

(iv.) rendering portions of the College property or income available for University purposes:

(v.) the opening of Fellowships and Scholarships, and the conversion of Fellowships into Scholarships and Exhibitions:

(vi.) the creation of Open Scholarships:

(vii.) the incorporation of Bye-Fellowships with the original foundation:

(viii.) transferring to the College any trusts vested in any one or more of the Masters and Fellows:

(ix.) and generally for making further provision for maintaining and improving the discipline, studies, and good government of such College, and for amending the Statutes from time to time.

By Clause 26, if the University did not frame new Statutes to the satisfaction of the Commissioners by January 1, 1858, the Commissioners had power to frame Statutes themselves; and by Clause 29, if a College did not frame Statutes or framed insufficient Statutes by the same date, the Commissioners had power to frame Statutes for it. This method of procedure proved effective at both Universities, and in no case were the Commissioners called upon to exercise their special powers.

Clause 45 enacts that "From and after the first day of Michaelmas term, 1856, no person shall be required upon matriculating, or upon taking, or to enable him to take, any Degree in Arts, Law, Medicine, or Music, in the said University, to take any oath or to make any declaration or Subscription whatever; but such Degree shall not, until the person obtaining the same shall, in such manner as the University may from Time to Time prescribe, have subscribed a Declaration, stating that he is *bona-fide* a Member of the Church of England, entitle him to be or to become a Member of the Senate, or constitute a Qualification for the holding of any Office, either in the University or elsewhere, which was heretofore always held by a Member of the United Church of England and Ireland, and for which such Degree has heretofore constituted one of the Qualifications."

The aged Lord Lyndhurst (he was now in his eighty-ninth year) had thus triumphed over Mr. Heywood and secured the exclusion of Nonconformists from membership of the Senate to which their degrees would otherwise have entitled them, and also from any share in the government of the University. So slowly did the idea die, that the University belonged to the Church of England and not to the nation.

The positive results of the Acts were seen in the increased number of matriculations and the general advance of the Universities. "The work of the Royal Commission appointed in 1850," writes Mr. J. A. Venn,¹ "bore fruit some years later, in the shape of a new and surprising increase in the number of students, and in the altered conditions of academic life and study which were brought to pass. . . There can be little doubt but that the Commission was the direct cause of the extraordinary rise in numbers which followed. . . During the thirty years 1850-1880 the numbers of the Freshmen at Cambridge were exactly doubled, rising from 400 to 800 per annum." Part of this increase, however, must be put down to the Act of 1871 which went so far towards abolishing religious tests. But when all allowances have been made, the fact remains that the Acts of 1854 and 1856 started the Universities on a new period of prosperity.

¹ *Matriculations*, pp. 16-17.

Yet they by no means fulfilled all the hopes of the reformers. Mark Pattison writes of Oxford: ¹“The intervention of the Legislature in 1854 was made by it, and submitted to by us, in an unhappy spirit, which, in a great degree falsified the relation between the parties. After two centuries of neglect, the House of Commons had been brought to the point of considering the state of the Universities. The movement was by no means a spontaneous one on the part of the House or the Government. They were brought to it, reluctantly enough, by the patient persevering efforts of a minority of University men. Their reluctance to touch the case was intelligible, for it had all the characteristics which make a business distasteful to members of Parliament. It was wrapt up in new, intricate, esoteric details, requiring much study to master; it related to the transcendental parts of education; it involved religious party and the Established Church. Ill understood, the question was ill cared for. So much of it as could be brought upon the platform was made into a party topic, and debated with excited temper and party exaggeration. The usual result followed. The House passed the Government Bill, maiming it in vital points in its passage through Committee.

“Our mode of receiving the measure was still less worthy of our character. The University of Oxford, remembering that its last appearance on the stage of history had been in resistance to the encroachment of the Crown, took legal advice as to whether it could not resist even the preliminary inquiry. Besides withholding all information from the Commission, a great deal of foolish bluster was talked about interference with private property and the illegality of the Commission. So great is the territorial influence of our great educational endowments that this unconstitutional language made an impression. The House of Commons only touched the ark of our property with half a heart. The Act nowhere asserts the rights of the nation over the national domain. The Preamble can scarcely be acquitted of dishonesty when in professing to recite what it was expedient to do, it omits to mention that the Act took powers to deal with

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 6, 7.

College property. In the same temper the executive Commission, when it came to divert College funds to new uses, only diverted an insignificant fraction."

And again, "The Act of 1854 was by no means the discharge in full of the Government's duty. It could not and did not pretend to be a reform of the Universities. The public and patent grievances which had long been urged were:—

"1. The incompetence of the Governing Body—the old Hebdomadal Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors.

"2. The close Fellowships and Scholarships.

"3. Inadequate teaching—the Tutors being incompetent and the Professors silent.

"4. The enforcement of religious tests.

"The Act of 1854 dealt with all four points. It treated 1 and 2 fully and confidently. 1. It abolished the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors. 2. It abolished local claims for Fellowships, and partially for Scholarships. 3. It did little for No. 3—partly from its timidity in dealing with College property, partly also because it was hoped that the abolition of close Fellowships would of itself raise the teaching capacities of the Tutors. 4. What it did under this head was the result of a compromise between parties in the House. The subscription was retained for the M.A. degree. How little of principle there was in the retention was shown by the Cambridge Act of the following year, which abolished all subscription for degrees.

"It would be ungrateful to its framers and promoters not to recognise heartily the great benefits which have been derived from the Act of 7th August, 1854. Its indirect effects in stimulating the spirit of improvement among us have been no less important than the specific reforms enacted by it. The last twenty years have seen more improvement in the temper and the teaching of Oxford than the three centuries since the Reformation. This improvement has undoubtedly been vastly promoted by the Reform Bill of 1854, or at least by one of its enactments. The abolition of close Fellowships has not only done more for us than all the other enactments of the measure together, but it is the only one which has completely answered the expectations then formed from it.

But the Act of 1854 could never claim to be a settlement of the University. It was merely an enabling Act, removing two evils of long standing, and giving very inadequate relief from two others. It cannot be premature to apply again to the Legislature to complete the work begun, and only begun in 1854.”¹

What is here said of Oxford applies in almost equal degree to Cambridge. The fact is that the two bodies of Commissioners went to the furthest point in their recommendations, the Bill as introduced by Lord John Russell fell short of the recommendations, the Act which was passed fell short of the Bill, and the subsequently appointed Commissioners were unable to make the best of the Act.

Two proofs may be adduced in confirmation of this last statement. They are drawn from the fate which overtook the recommendations of the Cambridge Commissioners with regard to (1) University teaching, and (2) College contributions to University purposes. “The Commissioners discovered, as they imagined, a panacea for all existing evils in the revivication (? revivification) of a teaching Professoriate. This teaching Professoriate formed the great feature of their Report; it was to be the nucleus about which the elements of the reformed University were to crystallize. . . Accordingly a Syndicate was appointed for the purpose of considering such of the recommendations as more directly affected the University. . . The chief points of the Report were fully discussed. The glaring defects of the Professorial system were balanced against its apparent merits and were found far to outweigh them. The grand scheme of public Lecturers by which the system was to be propped was seen to be a costly and hazardous experiment. . . The result was, that the Syndicate did not think it expedient to recommend the adoption of any measures for augmenting the existing means of teaching the students of the University by public Professors and public Lecturers.”² The Executive Commission had to acquiesce in the decision of the Syndicate.

¹ *Ib.* p. 23-24.

² *Campion, Cambridge Essays*, 1858, pp. 167-169.

As for College contributions to the University, the Executive Commission recommended "that there be paid into the University Chest, to be applied to University purposes, an annual sum equal to (say) *five* per cent. upon the distributable income of the Colleges."¹ The University never got its five per cent.

It was unfortunate that the readjustment of the relations between the University and the Colleges was made to turn on the extension of the Professoriate. The problem could not be solved on those lines then, any more than it can now. The division of the teaching proposed by the Cambridge Commission was impracticable. The Colleges had simply to sit still and things went on as before. The long-looked for contributions from the Colleges disappeared with the teaching scheme. They had been demanded for an impossible purpose, and this was sufficient reason for not giving them at all.

The general effect of these Acts on public opinion and the agitation for University Reform deserves a word of notice. Students of practical politics are well aware of the way in which even the partial remedying of a grievance affects the movement for its abolition. For the time being it can stop the movement altogether, or put off its complete success for many years. The larger part of the grievance may still remain, but something has been done; the British public is satisfied, and it is impossible to rouse it to further activity.

Then, again, one chief result of the two Acts was to leave the Nonconformists smarting as keenly as ever under a sense of injustice. When the grossest of the educational abuses had been swept away at Oxford and Cambridge, and public opinion was satisfied, the Nonconformists with their religious grievance were left in possession of the field. Educational reform, pure and simple, sank into the back-ground, and tests became the one object of agitation till the Act of 1871 partially removed them. These various causes produced a complete change in the character of the demand for reform. The question of University *v.* Colleges died away altogether; the great majority of the present generation

¹ *Ib.* p. 221.

probably do not know that it was ever raised, certainly they are unaware of the intensity of the conflict which once raged round it. From 1856 then the agitation enters on a new phase. It becomes political; later on subsidiary educational reforms engross attention, and so the old contention, with its far-reaching issues, dies down and its memory fades away.

CHAPTER VIII.

1856—1871.

As the Reform agitation which culminated in the Act of 1832 stirred up a movement in favour of University Reform, so did the agitation which culminated in the Act of 1867. "In May 1866," says Mark Pattison, who was then Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, "a few Members of Convocation met in the chambers of Mr. Osborne Morgan, Lincoln's Inn, to consider some University matters. A wish was expressed by the meeting for fuller information and suggestions. As no one else could be readily found to undertake the task, I have ventured to offer the following notes and hints. They are but a very imperfect contribution towards a scheme for making Oxford a University fully adequate to the wants of the nation." These "notes and hints" make up the volume entitled "Suggestions on Academical Organisation with especial reference to Oxford." Though now obsolete in many respects, as are all these old writings on University Reform, it yet contains so much acute criticism and so many wise suggestions that no one can afford to neglect it. Along with Sir William Hamilton's *Discussions*, it must be accounted among the chief contributions made to the subject. Under

SEC. 1. OF LEGISLATIVE INTERFERENCE,

Pattison thus defines his object: "My endeavour will be to show that the Colleges are not now performing the function designed by their founders, and to urge that they should be enabled by legislative interposition to resume that function."¹ He next discusses the principles on which this legislative interposition should proceed. "The Legislature of this country is now fairly in presence of the question, *What* it shall do with its seminaries of the higher education? That the Legislature should have

¹ *Suggestions*, p. 18.

clearly realised the extent of its rights is the best guarantee we can have that it will recognise their limitation. That there is a limit to the power of the State in its treatment of its one great scientific corporation will not be questioned. It is only by perfect freedom in its internal administration that such a corporation can discharge its trust." Here then is the negative limit. On the other side there are the positive principles of Government action. "Protection is not enough. It must be among the duties of Government, under its responsibilities to the nation, to watch unintermittingly over the University, and to see that it does in practice efficiently discharge the functions assigned to it. If the Legislature only steps in when crying abuses have accumulated, it is hardly possible that justice will be done by a popular assembly, heated with previous struggles between those who exaggerate in denouncing, and those who exaggerate in defending, the abuse. The University submits with discontent as to a tyrannical intruder, and the Legislature, unacquainted from disuse with the matter on which it has to legislate, gladly escapes from an unwelcome task by an Act, which passed, it dismisses the subject for an indefinite period. This is the point at which the University question is found to be involved in that more general question which constitutes the governmental problem of the time, both in this country and in Europe at large, how to hold the balance, namely, between centralisation and self-government. . . . A closer connection with the central power would quicken our zeal and concentrate our energies."¹

Pattison thus saw the necessity of keeping the Universities in touch with the national life, and especially in touch with national education. But the method whereby he proposed to effect this end may not strike everybody as the most effective which could be found. "Why," he asks, "should the Crown not exercise such a function? Our relations with the State might be re-established, in a mode as little revolutionary as may be, by giving the Crown the nomination of the Chancellor. He should be a lay person nominated for life, be unpaid, but have a paid secretary and an office through which all communications

¹ *Ib.* pp. 20, 21.

should pass. An annual report should be laid before him by each University officer. It should be his duty to examine these reports, and to bring before the University Council any matters arising upon such reports. He should be *ex-officio* a member of the Hebdomadal Council, and his motions, to be made *aut per se aut per alium*, should take precedence of those of any other member. . . . In compensation for surrendering its right of electing its own Chancellor, the University should acquire an official recognition in place of the unofficial and somewhat *ex-parte* championship expected of her Chancellor in his place as a Peer in Parliament. Official recognition in the Government would supersede for the future spasmodic and occasional efforts of Parliamentary legislation. Such intermittent government is to be deprecated. . . . But the Colleges once started on a new career, powers of internal legislation should be entrusted to the University, which would enable it, under proper safeguards, to avoid for the future a repetition of the deadlock which now necessitates an appeal to Parliament.”¹ Whatever may be thought of the suggestion of a Crown-appointed Chancellor who would play the part of King Stork, rather than that of King Log, all will agree that a never-ending series of Royal Commissions, each resulting in fresh legislation, is a thing greatly to be deprecated. The next Royal Commission and the resulting Act of Parliament should be the last, and should leave the Universities free to develop on right lines without fear of further interference.

Pattison next passes to

SEC. 2.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY.

Much of what he suggests has been carried out, but some of his points still remain to be dealt with. As for the *Hebdomadal Council*, he suggested that the threefold division into Heads, Professors, and Masters should be replaced by a division according to the Faculties, while it should be relieved of all matters relating to Studies and Examinations, these being assigned to a separate body.

With regard to *Congregation*, he writes:—

“All that is now asked is that effect should be given to the original scheme of Congregation—a scheme of

¹ *Ib.* pp. 21, 22.

which nothing but the name has ever been in operation. As if its usefulness was not sufficiently crushed by making it 'an Epitome of Convocation,' jealousy of its power went the length of—(1) dividing the vote from the debate; and (2) denying it the power of amending. Both these disabilities should be abrogated. . . . When reconstituted as proposed, it would be a body not equal to the Council for the detailed conduct of business and shaping of measures, but likely to take broader views of principle and policy."¹

On the subject of *Convocation*, Pattison says: "If Congregation were reinstated in its destined rights, it seems to follow that it would be necessary to put an end to the legislative functions of Convocation. . . . It appears to me that this single measure, could it possibly be carried, would be a greater revolution in the University than all the reforms of 1854, or than any other reforms that are thought of now. Is it not clear on the face of it that it would be to transfer at one stroke the foundation of the University from property to intelligence?"² In spite of this strong reason for action Pattison hesitates. "Congregation, as we propose to reform it, would be a purely educational body, entirely divested of (professional or territorial) interests. Are we prepared to sever the ties which at present bind our national Universities to the country and its interests, and hand them over to intelligence? Is our country ripe for such a measure? I wish I could think so."³ If the country was not ripe in 1868, it certainly ought to be ripe in 1913. This essential change and a more scientific method of keeping Oxford and Cambridge in touch with the national life will be discussed later on.

After legislation comes administration. The chief executive officer of the University is the *Vice-Chancellor*. With reference to him Pattison writes: "The Vice-Chancellorship has been choked by an over-growth of merely formal duties. . . . He should be set free from the drudgery of the desk, and from the transaction of purely formal business. The ceremonies attending degrees and presiding in Convocation might be delegated

¹ *Ib.* pp. 30-31.

² *Ib.* pp. 31, 32.

³ *Ib.* p. 33.

to deputies (pro-Vice-Chancellors). Instead of being an *ex-officio* member of every delegacy, and so obliged to attend every sitting of every Board or Committee, it would be better that he should not be on any, but have reports made to him of the results arrived at when the work of detail had been accomplished. His higher energies would thus be set free for deliberation in Council, and his nominal presidency changed into a real one. His time would be more at liberty to cultivate the University relations with the world outside. For the purpose of entertaining strangers and foreigners, an official residence should be assigned him with adequate appointments. This lofty station could excite no jealousy, as the existing usage might be confirmed by statute—viz. that the holder of the office should go out at the end of four years.¹ . . I would leave the nomination with the Chancellor, but would extend his range of selection as widely as could safely be done. If proper security can be taken that the Chancellor shall no longer be a party man, and make party appointments, all limitations on his choice could be removed.”²

After advocating the formation of a Financial Board to deal with University property and revenues, Pattison asks this revolutionary question:—

“Why should not the Colleges be relieved of the burden of management of their property, and throw their accounts into the same office, with proper provisions for superintendence, in which the University business is to be conducted?”³

SEC. 3.—OF THE ENDOWMENTS.

Under this head, Pattison defines the problem thus: “For a great national purpose which we have in view, how can we make the endowments go as far as possible in promoting it?”⁴ and he continues: “The distribution of the nett residue of University and College revenues taken together may be considered as taking place in three channels:—

“1. One portion, being the great bulk of our

¹ Now reduced at Oxford to three. At Cambridge the term is two.

² *Ib.* pp. 33-40.

³ *Ib.* p. 44.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 51.

income, is laid out in subsidising education, in the shape of Scholarships, Exhibitions to Students, and Fellowships to graduates.

“2. Another portion, of smaller amount, is expended in the payment of Teachers, *i.e.* Professors, Lecturers, Chaplains, Deans, or Officers of Discipline.

“3. Lastly, a third, but inconsiderable, fraction of our income is appropriated to the maintenance and encouragement of science and learning, canonries, headships, libraries, museums, etc.”

SEC. 4.—ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE ENDOWMENT FUND.

Pattison then considers these three in order, beginning with

Subsidies to Education.

“This outlay upon students’ pensions may be made, according to the mode of its distribution, to answer three quite distinct purposes:—(1) It may be given as prizes to merit, and so serve to stimulate industry. (2) It may be given to poverty, and so serve to give the means of education to those who would be otherwise unable to pay for it. (3) It may operate as a bounty on a particular kind of education—*i.e.* it may be a mode of creating an artificial demand for classics, or mathematics, while the natural course of supply and demand would lead to the establishment of other kinds of education.”¹

“The complaint of the costliness of a University education is one of the oldest and most urgent complaints which has been standing against us. The reduction of College expenses was, at the time of the Commission of 1850, a first object with the public,” and the Commission recommended a large augmentation of Open Scholarships. “The result of twelve years’ experience is that the intentions of the Commission have been carried out, and the expectations of the public have not been realised. Open Scholarships have been multiplied on all sides with eager rivalry. The market is glutted. . . . Yet University education is not cheapened. For what Colleges have done in the way of reduction of their fees and charges with one hand, they have undone with the other, by lavish allowances to their scholars. We

¹ *Ib.* p. 57.

have secretly supplied fuel to the fire we were engaged in extinguishing. Well-to-do parents continue to make their sons the usual allowance, and the Scholar treats his £80 a year as so much pocket-money to be spent in procuring himself extra luxuries. . . It is said that the increase of the matriculations proves that a poorer class have reaped some of the benefit of the creation of Scholarships. . . But even if our increased numbers be to a slight extent due to the increased number of the Open Scholarships, this does not show that Scholarships aid poor men. The question is not, Has multiplication of Scholarships drawn more men to Oxford? but, Has it brought the University within the reach of a class socially below the class which frequented it before? I think the answer must be that it has *not*. . . The Open Scholarship Fund, then, does not act as an instrument of University extension. It acts as prize-money. . . The national outlay under the head 'Scholarships and Exhibitions' is so much prize-money distributed among the grammar-schools, the University being merely the competent and impartial examiner. . . There can be no doubt that a most powerful impulse has been given to the grammar-schools by the opening of the Scholarships. The same social class as before frequents the schools, but a direction and a motive have been supplied to their industry which were before wanting. On the University itself the effect has been no less beneficial. Even if it has not increased the numbers, or the amount of talent, it has brought that talent forward in a way in which it was not before. . . The Scholars constitute an order bound to study as much by the opinion of their fellows as by the tenure of their gowns. The existence of such an order is beneficial beyond its own pale by influence and example. Study, from being the peculiarity of an exceptional minority, is becoming, let us say with thankfulness, more and more the tone of a large proportion of the students in many Colleges, though in too many others the traditions of Eton still give the law to undergraduate opinion."¹

"No one then," continues the writer, "is proposing

¹ *Ib.* pp. 56-60.

to alter the present Scholarship system. But there are two opinions prevalent as to additions which may be made to the fund.

“1. There are many University reformers who wish to see a further and large creation of Prize Scholarships.

“2. There is an influential section of opinion which is in favour of a large creation of Exhibitions, which should not be awarded as prizes, but given to ‘poor men.’”¹

As for (1), the fund from which more Scholarships are demanded is the Fellowships. “I am ready to admit,” says Pattison, “that the Fellowships as now bestowed do not answer any proper purpose, and that the time has come when the destination of that fund should be reconsidered. . . . But it is not wanted for Scholarships. . . . The scholar’s gown is too often to be found on youths who have no vocation for science or literature, and whom it was no kindness to have drawn away from their proper destination to active life. They have come here as a commercial speculation. High wages are given for learning Latin and Greek, and they are sent to enlist to earn the pay. In other words, we fear that the Scholarships have been multiplied beyond the limit within which they act as an incentive to industry, and that they are become a bounty upon a privileged species of education. . . . When we consider, out of our 1700 students, how many are here chiefly because they are paid to come here, the reflection will arise, Can an education which requires so heavy a pecuniary premium to get itself accepted be really the excellent thing we profess it to be?”²

A further pungent criticism follows. “Even as a Prize system, we are in danger of leaning too much upon it. These competitive examinations, even while they urge to work, have a fatal tendency to falsify education. Open Scholarships have not been an unmixed good. They have stirred up the schools, but they have also stirred up an unwholesome system of training the competitors for the race. The youth comes up with a varnish of accomplishment beyond his real powers. He

¹ *Ib.* p. 61.

² *Ib.* pp. 61-63.

has caught the spirit of his professional trainers. He has learned to regard his classics, not as the portals of a real knowledge, but as the verbal material of an athletic conflict. It is useless for real genius to enter the lists of competition without this training. It is easy for mediocrity, by putting itself under training, to reach one of the prizes. Thus a life has been quickened among us, but it is not a thoroughly sound and healthy life.”¹

Pattison makes the following suggestions:—

1. The number of Prize Scholarships might be diminished with advantage.

2. The value of each Scholarship is too large. “This value has reached its present dimensions by the accidental division of the University into independent, and, for this purpose, rival houses.² Every College is desirous to have its rooms full, and every College is desirous of showing as many University honours as it can. Consequently the Colleges outbid each other in the general market for talent.”

Under 3, Pattison then makes a suggestion of great importance. “Fewer Scholarships, and of less money-value, would, I think, have fully as great an effect as at present, if, instead of being given away for the convenience of each College, they were organised on a footing common to the whole University. A fixed number should be vacant every year, assignable among the Colleges in the proportions of their respective contributions to the Prize Fund. An examination might be held twice in the year. It should be conducted by Boards of Examiners, one for each of the subjects to which prizes were assigned—one half of these Examiners to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, the other half by the Professors (in turns) of the several faculties to which the Boards would belong.”³

Pattison then passes to consider the demand for more *Exhibitions*, or sums granted in aid of poverty. He is not enthusiastic about them. In the first place there would be the difficulty of raising a sufficiently large fund. In the second place a better use might be made of the

¹ *Ib.* p. 65.

² Pattison here shows himself aware of the defects of the College system, in spite of his defence of it on other occasions.

³ *Ib.* p. 66.

money. Then the Exhibitions would probably fall to those who came nearest to the successful candidates in the Scholarship Examinations; in which case "we shall but have increased the number of the existing prizes, already too numerous, and failed in bringing up a single representative of a new and poorer class to Oxford."¹ In the fourth place there is "the impracticability of any equitable gauge of poverty, either by testimonial or inquiry." His own suggestion is that "it would be very desirable that there should be in each College a small reserve fund, out of which subsidies could be granted to meet cases (of poverty) when they occur."² "The endowment of Exhibitions," he goes on to say, "is a mode of meeting cost, which, even when most lavishly employed, can only add to our numbers by tens. It can never 'extend' the University to a newer and lower class of English society. If this is to be done, the expensiveness must be attacked in its causes. Instead of subsidising the poor student up to the level of our expenses, we ought to bring down the expenses to the level of the poor. It is idle to say we cannot. We have never tried."³

When will these plain and true words have their due effect? It is forty-five years since Pattison wrote them, and they describe the facts as correctly now as they did then.

Pattison's first remedy for the high cost of a University career was the system of *Unattached Students*, i.e. of students who are members of the University without being members of any of the Colleges. They are in fact a return to the old state of things when all the students were of necessity non-collegiate because the Colleges had not yet come into existence.

He further admits that the price of education at Oxford is artificially enhanced. "That this enhancement is due mainly to the College and Tutorial system no one will deny. . . *Compulsory* residence within College walls must cease to be the law of the University."⁴

¹ *Ib.* p. 71.

² *Ib.* p. 74.

³ *Ib.* p. 76.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 76-79. Here we have yet another criticism of the College system which should be read in conjunction with Pattison's defence of it quoted at pp. 98-99.

Pattison's second remedy was the improvement of the instruction given. "To cheapen the cost of a University education is only one half of University extension. The education given must be better adapted to the wants of the class intended to benefit by it. Let Oxford become, as nothing but artificial legislation prevents it from becoming, the first school of science and learning in the world, and at the same time let it be accessible at the cost only of board and lodging, and it will attract pupils enough. If what we have to teach requires to be bolstered up by bounties to the taught, that is evidence that what we have to teach is not recognised as of intrinsic utility. If what the public is calling for under the name of University extension means certain social advantages, at the University and afterwards, for their sons, let them understand that these advantages cannot be had cheap, and if had, ought to be paid for by those who get them. Exhibitions are a means of extending to a small additional number—a favoured few—this privilege. But aristocratic society must always remain a privilege, and always be costly. Social combinations apart, the necessities of life cost no more in Oxford than in other towns in the South of England. The inducement to spend three years here can only be found in improving the instruction. The true solution of the problem of University extension is to be found at last not in expedients for recruiting more students, but in raising the character and reputation of the body of teachers."¹ This last is our author's sovereign remedy for University ills. It would have been interesting if he had explained in detail how the University was to "be accessible at the cost only of board and lodging." How was free tuition to have been provided?

Fellowships.

As for Fellowships, Pattison, after showing that the old system imposed upon the Fellow, as a condition of his tenure, a course of study of from twenty to twenty-five years, goes on to discuss the effect of the Act of 1854 on them. He says: "The (College) ordinances in every

¹ *Ib.* p. 81.

instance abolish the statutable regulations of studies and exercises, as well as the obligation to proceed to the superior degrees. In no instance do they attempt to substitute an equivalent. But though no duties are provided for him to perform, the Fellow is maintained in the enjoyment of his stipend and emoluments. In other words, the ordinances of the Commission of 1854 converted the Fellowships into sinecures. The Commissioners found an enormous abuse existing illegally, and they legalised it.”¹ And again: “Fellowships are pensions conferred in recompense or acknowledgment of meritorious exertions in the past. . . The Commissioners transferred them from the category of benefices entailing duties, to that of sinecure benefices obtainable by qualification.”² . . They are educational prizes. The Fellowships, as now administered, are to the academical course what the Scholarships are to the grammar-school, so much prize-money offered for competition among the scholars.”³

Pattison’s own view is thus expressed:—“Ability based on force of character, on tenacity, and industry, is what educational endowments seek to find and bring out. We must keep the Fellowships as well as the Scholarships free from the taint of a system which invites men to come to the Universities, simply because they are poor, and because they see in them a way to a good pension on easy terms. To do this the prize-Fellowships must be restricted in numbers, and rigidly bestowed so as to bring out the greatest amount of exertion. . . The next stage to a Scholarship should be a post in the public service, with prospect of promotion by merit.”⁴

The writer’s sketch of the educational position as he saw it in his day can still be read with profit:—

“Next to a regular connection between the public service and the University course, a re-establishment of the local grammar-schools would be necessary if we are to keep open the highway. The decay of the local grammar-schools had cut off the supply of men to the Universities at its source. But that decay itself was only one of the minor symptoms of the social revolution

¹ *Ib.* pp. 89, 90.

² *Ib.* p. 94.

³ *Ib.* p. 98.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 100, 104.

in progress. The youth of the lower middle class left the grammar-school because it no longer taught them what it was their interest to learn. The commercial schools grew up, which taught nothing well, but which professed to teach the things they wished to learn. The public, which judges by profession, and not by performance, adopted the commercial academy. The local grammar-school decayed, or turned itself, in order to live, into a commercial school. Our middle-class youth passed into life without approaching the Universities, without the faintest trace of the culture which still remained the traditional culture of the nation. The whole commercial and moneyed class—from the great capitalists down to the point where it merges in the small retailer—became separated by an impassable gulf of education from the professional classes.

“But mark well the reversal of social importance which had accompanied the growth of this separation. Down to the end of the wars of the French Revolution (1815), the aristocratical, political, professional, and clerical sections of society had been everything in social consideration. These classes had clung to the traditions of liberal education. But the enormous development of commerce and manufactures since 1815 has opened a new world to energy. The career opened by commercial enterprise to the middle class is a far more tempting career than those opened by the old road of the professional and public life. The thousands who tread this path go without any education properly so called. Yet these classes are in possession of great political power and social consideration, which throws that of the professions into the shade, and almost balances the power of the territorial aristocracy. What is the consequence? It is that these moneyed classes, containing the better half of the nation's wealth and life, lie outside the pale of our educational system. What they have not got they despise. Liberal education confined to one half—and the least energetic half—of the wealthy classes, is depreciated. The great highway of successful life no longer lies through the Universities. We wish to restore the road, and maintain one broad-gauge line of refining education, along which all our youth, the aspiring and the enterprising, as well

as the fanieant aristocrat and the apathetic dullard, shall be willing to travel. It is impossible seriously to propose that this shall be done by pensions. What would £100,000 a year distributed in pensions do, if tried as a set-off against the prizes which await skill and energy in business? Our endowment fund is considerable, but I believe it is not equal to this task—that of buying up the best talent of the country. If we can succeed in making the education given meet the demands of all classes, all classes will desire to have it. If we want the old road to be travelled, we must repair it, not pay pilgrims so much a head, like a starving Swiss inn-keeper, for going our route.”¹

Of Endowments of Science and Learning.

Under this head Pattison gives a first hint of his own particular scheme of University reorganisation. “The present scheme proposes to convert the whole of the Fellowship endowments from educational prizes into endowments for science and literature, and I would propose to include the endowments of the Headships in the same category.”² And again: “In our arrangement the Colleges are divided into those which, ceasing to receive boarders, will be appropriated to one of the incorporated Faculties, and into those which will remain boarding-houses.”³

This scheme of University reform is elaborated under

SEC. 5-6. THE RE-DISTRIBUTION OF THE ENDOWMENT FUND.

It involves the fundamental question of What is a University?⁴ “The great bulk of our endowments—so large a part that we may almost say the whole—is expended on youths under the age of twenty-four—*i.e.* it has an educational effect. What is expended on promoting science and learning is, by comparison, trifling, and, from the peculiar mode of its bestowal, almost unproductive of any fruits. This is the actual direction taken by the National Endowment Fund. And it stands in direct contrast with the original destination of that fund. The endowments, in the design of the founders, were endowments for men and not for youth, and were not directed to education as a preparation for life, but to knowledge as a peculiar profession which withdrew men from the

¹ *Ib.* pp. 101-103.

² *Ib.* p. 112.

³ *Ib.* p. 114.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 120.

ordinary professions, and all those careers which are self-paying, and which could therefore only be supported by way of endowment."

But Pattison is careful not to rest his case on historical grounds alone: "I make no claim for the restoration of what once was, and has ceased to be, merely because it once was. I only seek to have the real issue clearly brought out before debate on University Reform is the order of the day. No questions of detail can be entered on, or particular applications of funds determined, till we have settled the relative claims of Education *v.* Science." The origin of the Oxford Colleges is then gone into to show "the difference between an endowment for science and an endowment for education."¹

Having shown how Oxford became a school, instead of a place of learning, he continues:—"When we adopt, and acquiesce in, this view of ourselves, we cannot complain if the public take us at our own valuation. If you are a school, the public not unnaturally argues that you are a very costly school. All those extensive buildings, those magnificent endowments, all those Canons, Heads, Professors, Fellows, Tutors, to educate some 1700 pupils! . . . Certainly the Oxford B.A. ought to be the most finished specimen of education in the world, if cost of production is the measure of value. £120,000 a year applied as prize-money or bonus distributable among Scholars, and another £50,000 a year spent on Teachers and Masters out of endowments, besides nearly another £50,000 levied in fees by Tutors, private and public. . . . It has been determined that we are a school, and that we shall be nothing else. Tried by this standard, the public will discover two facts—1st, That we are not the right sort of school for its purposes; 2nd, That such a school as it wants could be conducted for probably a fourth of the cost, and that the other three-fourths of the endowment are superfluous."²

A forecast is then made of the direction which reform, under these circumstances, is likely to take. "It is not desired to destroy us but to make us useful. If the public were to take us in hand now, it would no doubt

¹ *Ib.* p. 121.

² *Ib.* pp. 135, 136.

try to set up a school of liberal education for its youth, in which the measure of attainment would be what will get him on in life. And the measure of life would be an empirical one,—not life as it might be, but life as it is. Thus the type of our middle-class, such as it now is, would be perpetuated. Education, instead of an elevating influence, would become, as in China, the stamp of a uniform pattern. At the same time, it is probable that the first result of such a principle of reform would be an increased efficiency of Oxford as a school. We should have a varied staff of masters, under whom every sort of accomplishment might be acquired in little time, or at little cost, and youth prepared to pass unnumbered competitive examinations in any subject. The hive would be purified; the drones would be driven out. The danger on which the *Times* dwells, that we are getting to know too much, and to do too little, would be abated. Every one would be doing a day's work, and receiving a salary in proportion."¹

This is certainly the direction in which things have moved at Cambridge, though we have not reached the happy state described in the last sentence. But Pattison held such seeming progress to be a "catastrophe," and asks eagerly, Can we do anything towards averting it? His reply is: "There remains only one thing to be tried:—we must engage in a grapple with public opinion, and endeavour to graft upon it, by discussion and by the reason of the thing, an idea of the purposes and the possibilities of a University, which is at present wanting alike to its conception, and to our practice. We must do nothing less than ask that the College endowments be restored to their original purpose—that of the promotion of science and learning."²

Next comes a series of reasons to show that this is not a Quixotic and hopeless proposal.

1. It is not a question of a new tax to be levied. The money is already there.

2. The mode of its present expenditure is not merely useless, but actually hurtful. "The endowments of schools and Colleges diminish the necessity of

¹ *Ib.* p. 138.

² *Ib.* p. 139.

application in the teachers, their subsistence being secured by a fund, independent of their success and reputation in their profession.”¹

3. The clear ground ought to be taken “that the highest form of education is culture for culture’s sake. It must stand not in opposition to professional life, but above it. The energy of a secular success is one only of the conditions of moral life, and not the whole of it. Refinement, if not actually a subtraction from public energy, is not a basis for it. Education is to be a preparation for life. Be it so. But then life is not all fighting. When we shall dare to say these things, and can show an education which, while it fits for the struggle, yet leads up to a view of life which is above the struggle, our position will not be confused by a cross issue, we shall not be coming before the world on false pretences.”²

4. “It is ignorance, and not ill-will, that directs the popular discussions on the subject of the highest education. Men in general cannot imagine what they have seen no example of. To expect that the public should at once admit the idea of the Universities becoming the intellectual and educational metropolis of the country, would be quite unreasonable.”

Supposing, then, this principle of University Reform to be granted, “the question arises, What form must the institution assume to give it a scope and influence proper to its time? Three conditions of the success of such a body may be laid down:—(1) It must be organised; (2) The persons composing it must be appointed for eminent merit, and not for other considerations; (3) There must be security taken that when appointed they devote themselves to the promotion of knowledge, and not engage in other pursuits or subside into indifference.”³

1. It must be an organisation of science. College funds might be spent in giving pensions to men of science known to be engaged in independent researches. But isolated life-pensions are not to be compared with an institution organised for perpetual succession. All the advantages of the spirit of association may probably be secured without a common domestic life. “The *collegium*,

¹ *Ib.* p. 142.

² *Ib.* pp. 145, 146.

³ *Ib.* p. 155.

the incorporated society, having a common purse and purpose, is still required; but the College, in the modern sense of the building, is not always fitted to be the home of the individual members of the corporation, who must be free to marry. In some instances the existing College buildings might be appropriated for the residence of the future married Fellows. This would especially be desirable in the case of those foundations which were affected to the cultivation of particular studies. If it were proposed, *e.g.* to amalgamate Merton with Corpus Christi College, and to dedicate the united College to the study of Biology, Chemistry, and the allied branches, the buildings might in this case be wholly appropriated to the use of the families of the Fellows. In other cases, where no such special dedication took place, a College might remain fitted up in separate chambers as at present, and be let as lodging to junior students.”¹

2. “A place in a reformed College will be much more worth having than a Fellowship is now, and it will be of greater public concern that it should be properly filled. The question of appointment resolves itself into two:—(1) Who is to appoint? (2) What test of merit is the appointing officer to employ? The present method of co-optation will no longer be applicable. An examination test is not to be thought of. . . There remains but one possible pattern on which a University, as an establishment for science, can be constructed, and that is the graduated Professoriate. This is sometimes called the German type. . . The German University is an association of men of learning and science under the title of Professors. The position created for them is such as to place them under the most powerful inducements to devote their whole mind and energies to the cultivation of some special branch of knowledge. . . In proposing the German University as the model to which we must look in making any alterations in our own, I wish to confine myself entirely to this single point of view—viz. of a central association of men of science. . . What I wish to contend is, that the Professor of a modern University ought to regard himself primarily as a learner, and a

¹ *Ib.* pp. 156, 157.

teacher only secondarily. His first obligation is to the Faculty he represents; he must consider that he is there on his own account, and not for the sake of his pupils. The pupils, indeed, are useful to him, as urging him to activity of mind, to clearness of expression, to definiteness of conception, to be perpetually turning over and verifying the thoughts and truths which occupy him.

“But we must go further than this: Even merely to be efficient as teacher, the University teacher must hold up to himself a higher standard of attainment than the possession of so much as has to be communicated to the pupil. . . . No teacher who is a teacher only, and not himself a daily student, who does not speak from the love and faith of a habitual intuition, can be competent to treat any of the higher parts of any moral or speculative science. . . . Our weakness of late years has been that we have not felt this;—we have known no higher level of knowledge than so much as sufficed for teaching. Hence education among us has sunk into a trade, and, like trading sophists, we have not cared to keep on hand a larger stock than we could dispose of in the season. Our Faculties have dried up, have become dissociated from professional practice at one end, and from scientific investigation at the other, and degrees in them have lost all value but a social one. . . . It is because our life here is wanting in scientific dignity, in intellectual purpose, in the ennobling influence of the pursuit of knowledge, that our action upon the young is so feeble. The trading teacher, whatever disguise he may assume—whether he call himself Professor or Tutor—is the mere servant of his young master. But true education is the moulding of the mind and character of the rising generation by the generation that now is. We cannot communicate that which we have not got. To make others anything we must first be it ourselves.”¹

Pattison urges these considerations again and again. “It cannot be repeated too often that the drift of these ‘Suggestions’ is the conversion, or restoration of College endowments to the maintenance of a professional class of learned and scientific men.” And again: “In order to

¹ *Ib.* pp. 157-167.

make Oxford a seat of education, it must first be made a seat of science and learning. All attempts to stimulate its *teaching* activity, without adding to its solid possession of the field of science, will only feed the unwholesome system of examination which is now undermining the educational value of the work we do. . . The Professor-Fellow is to teach, but his business is to learn, not to teach.¹ . . . Not to enlarge the sciences, or to heap up libraries, is our object, but to maintain through successive generations an order of minds, in each of the great departments of human inquiry, cultivated to the utmost point which their powers admit of.”²

He adds: “It may be necessary to guard the suggestion of this principle against misconception on another side. The University is to be an association of men of science. But it is not for the sake of science that they are associated. Whether or no the State should patronise science, or promote discovery, is another question. Even if it should, a University is not the organ for this purpose. A Professoriate has for its duty to maintain, cultivate, and diffuse extant knowledge. This is an every-day function which should not be confounded with the very exceptional pursuit of prosecuting researches or conducting experiments with a view to new discoveries. The Professoriate is ‘to know what is known and definitely acquired for humanity on the most important human concerns.’”³

Outline of a Scheme.

Pattison now proceeds to outline his scheme more definitely.⁴ His University is one where no branch of human knowledge is excluded, but where every subject which it is for the interest of the community to have preserved and diffused, is professed. The corrective to the seeming infinity of this cadre is supplied by the old classification of Faculties. These are:—

Theology.

Law.

Medicine.

Classics.

¹ *Ib.* p. 198.

² *Ib.* p. 227.

³ pp. 171, 172.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 173.

Philology and Language.

Historical and Moral Sciences.

Mathematical and Physical Sciences.

“Each of these faculties will be organised as a deliberative body on its own arrangements, and will recommend from time to time such modifications in the material and number of its Professorships as occasion may require.” The collective Professors of each Faculty, whether associated in one or more Colleges, would form a General Board or Collegium, competent to make, subject to the organic statute,¹ from time to time, regulations for the conduct of the studies, lectures, and examinations in their Faculty. The senior Professor, as Dean of the Faculty, would be chairman of the Board.²

Pattison then examines the above Faculties in succession; but as his book is confined to University objects, he makes no suggestion about Theology, because he is here on ground which is not purely academical.

The Faculty of Law also presents difficulties. “Legal education has been wholly withdrawn from the English Universities. . . . Whatever the University may be able to do in the way of direct preparation of the legal practitioners must necessarily be concerted with the Inns of Court. . . . Ten or twelve Professor-Fellows of recognised eminence in various departments, incorporated in a Law-College, would give a very different aspect to the question of a University law-degree as a qualification for a call to the Bar. A good beginning has already been made at All Souls.”³

“For an endowment which is to sustain and encourage Historical Studies we must contemplate a much larger application of our Fellowship fund. . . . Nor can a nation, which at this moment conducts and reaps the profit of the commerce of the world, think that one Professor of Political Economy is a sufficient representation of those vast and important subjects. The phenomena of capital and labour, of currency and exchange, not only

¹ The reference is to p. 28, where it is recommended that the whole of the department “Studies and Examinations” should be placed under a special Delegacy, or Board, and an organic statute passed, defining the competency of this Board.

2 pp. 173-175.

3 *Ib.* pp. 178-184.

involve practical questions of the highest moment, but questions which even the public see cannot be elucidated without science and theory. It is impossible, without an apprehension of the laws of these phenomena, to form any adequate conception of the world we live in. We can no more understand the body politic and its history without political economy than we can understand the natural body without physiology.”¹ Oriel and Queen’s are suggested as the History Colleges, and as a home for Moral and Mental Science; Corpus and Merton, as already suggested, might furnish a home for the Biological Sciences; and the splendid endowments of Magdalen might go to the Mathematical and Experimental Sciences.

“As for the Faculty of Arts, in the special University sense, there must be at least three Colleges, or incorporated, endowed, bodies of Professors in it:—

1. A College of Classical Studies.
2. A College of Comparative Philology and the Science of Language.
3. A College of the Theory and History of Art.²

“An endowed Art-College might provide for (say) four Professors: Two, historical, dealing with—(1) Classical Archæology, Asiatic, Egyptian, &c., Art; (2) The period from the revival of Art to modern times. Two, of the Science and Æsthetic, dealing with—(1) Painting and Sculpture, Theory of Composition, Chiaroscuro, Style, &c.; (2) Architecture, Mechanics, Proportion, Balance, &c.”³

The proper income of the Professor-Fellow, and the best methods of appointing him, are then discussed, but these need not be further gone into. As a guarantee against the besetting danger of endowments—mental stagnation and apathy—a graduated system of promotion is recommended, or a four-fold scale rising in value:—

1. Tutors.
2. Lecturers.
3. Professors.
4. Senior Fellows (or Heads).⁴

Pattison then passes to

SEC. 6.—OF THE STUDIES PRELIMINARY TO THE DEGREE.

Here he necessarily touches on the principles of education, a vast subject which lies outside University

¹ *Ib.* pp. 185, 186.

² *Ib.* p. 193.

³ p. 196.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 210.

Reform proper. Omitting reference to this topic, it may be noted that the writer advocates a Special Delegacy or Board of Examinations, on the system of representing all the branches of study admitted in the University.¹

The Pass Examinations.

As to the distinction between "Pass" and "Class," i.e. the distinction between an Ordinary Degree and an Honours Degree, Pattison declares the "Pass" to be "a nullity"; and adds: "the Honour-students are the only students who are undergoing any educational process, which it can be considered as a function of a University either to impart or to exact; the only students who are at all within the scope of the scientific apparatus and arrangements of an academical body."² In those days the "Pass" men were 70 per cent. of the whole number of the students at Oxford and the "Class" men only 30 per cent. Pattison would have made short and speedy work of the "Pass" men. He writes: "Let Oxford once resume its higher functions, let it become the home of science and the representative of the best learning of the time, and what is now called a pass-degree will be seen at once to be an incongruity. . . . Let us once realise our lofty calling, and we shall find that we have quite enough to do in maintaining and adorning the vast structure of human knowledge to have time to occupy ourselves in the inculcation of the rudiments. . . . The arrangement, then, at which we should aim is, that the University should cease the pass-business altogether."³

The Examinations for Honours.

"The compulsory examination and the Pass Degree being supposed abolished, and a voluntary examination outside the University for youths under eighteen substituted for it, the next step follows as of course. The present standard of honours must become the qualification for the degree. The B.A. is superfluous and may be dropped. The M.A. degree may be taken at the end of three years *residence* by all whose names appear in any of the four classes in any of the schools. Residence must be at all costs preserved as a qualification."⁴

¹ *Ib.* p. 229.

² *Ib.* p. 230.

³ *Ib.* pp. 236-238.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 243.

“Examination must be restored to its proper place, and that is one of subordination to the curriculum of study, whatever that curriculum may be. Instead of, as now, the examination regulating the student’s preparation, and the examiner being supreme over the teacher, the position should be reversed. The examination should follow the course of study, arranged from time to time among the Professors of each faculty organised into a College of studies for that purpose.”¹

“Experience and reason seem to be both united in favour of the ‘voluntary principle’ as an indispensable condition of the higher education. But all liberty must be realised through law. We offer the degree, but on conditions. We exact residence; we test proficiency by examination. May we not go further, and prescribe a curriculum of lectures? I think we may, if such a condition is not arbitrary, but is founded in the nature of the case. . . A degree will be offered as a prize to the student on two conditions:—(1) That he has gone through a defined curriculum of study; (2) That he has done so with attention and profit. The courses of lectures delivered by the public teachers will henceforth be the centre of the system. When the teacherships are filled by men of real knowledge, and who are imbued with the idea of science, the teacher will no longer condescend to be guided in what he shall say by an Examination in prospect. The trade of the sophist will be gone when examination in fixed text-books is abolished.”²

Inter-Collegiate instruction (not then existing, but since established at both Universities), was the necessary corollary of such a scheme. “Let the scholar be free to select his teachers, and we need not anticipate any difficulty in getting the candidates for Honours to submit to a prescribed order of the subjects taught. . . It is a chief business of the University to lay down correct lines of study; from the vast mass of all that may be learned and may be taught, to select what should be taught and learned.”³

¹ *Ib.* pp. 248-249.

² *Ib.* pp. 253, 254.

³ *Ib.* pp. 255, 258.

The Conflict of Studies.

“The existing system of Oxford education is an attempt at an adjustment between two conflicting claims. The conflict of claims is between the general and the special. Every man has to earn his bread, and is also a member of civil society, a participant in common humanity, is a soul capable of a development or perfection of its own, and so may be the subject of a general or humane training and accomplishment. The problem is to combine specialty of function with generality of culture. In the last generation—*i.e.* thirty years ago, the Oxford curriculum was wholly liberal, or general. . . . After a long struggle with opinion we had to give way. In 1850 two new Schools—that of Law and History and that of Physical Science—succeeded in establishing themselves, but in a subordinate position to the School of Classics. Fifteen years more (1865), and the new Schools had thrust aside the once supreme Classics, and become alone a qualification for a degree. Classics may now be dropped entirely at Moderations. This is the adjustment between the general and the special. . . . But I am sure we shall not long rest content with the clumsy adjustment of the problem which we patched up two years ago. . . . The steps which we have already taken are in a right direction, but to make them safe we must go on. . . . What is meant by saying that the steps have been in a right direction is, that the recognition of special studies as qualification for a degree is in conformity with the true principle of University education. . . . No one will dispute that, in the development of the mind, there comes an epoch where a discursive ranging from province to province of information must give way to the inverse process of concentrating the energies of the intellect in undivided intensity upon some one object. The necessity for so doing is forced upon most men by the external pressure of a profession. . . . The division of labour is the law of mental, no less than of manufacturing, production. . . . The only point that can be questioned is, Ought this change to be postponed till after education is finished? Can the higher education be completed by general processes? Can

intellect be fully formed by formal discipline without special knowledge? The old University system answered the question in the negative. The practice of Oxford, for the last three centuries, since the introduction of the Classics as the instrument of education, has been founded on the opposite theory. It is essential to the revival of the University that it should recur to the older system. The principle of the old University system was a combination of the general and the special. . . The proposal made in the first part of these 'Suggestions,' for the application of the College endowments, was a proposal for the revival of faculty, or special studies. . . The principle I am now contending for goes further still in the direction of specialising study. I am contending for the introduction of definite, or faculty, studies at an earlier period of the curriculum and for all students. . . The necessity for founding the higher education on faculty studies lies in the reason of the thing, and not in the weight of authority or the force of precedent. The higher education must take hold of the highest mental faculty and form and develop it. This faculty is the scientific reason in its perfect form. . . The imagination and the taste; the employment and discernment of language; the perception of beauty by the eye; to speak, to write, to argue, to reason;—all these are capacities or accomplishments to be improved, or formed by education at some period. But all these form only a superficial mental character, if the great work of education, the establishment of an exact habit of judgment, of the philosophical intellect has not been achieved. . . The scientific habit can only be educed by setting the understanding to investigate for itself the laws of some one chief department, or division of objects. It is not the matters known that make science, but the mode of knowing." At the same time there is a qualification. "The higher education, as the portal through which the boy is to enter upon the duties of the man, must conform in its arrangements to those of the social system to which he belongs; . . it must adapt itself to the requirements of daily existence. . . There is no reason why every class of vocation in which intelligence and refinement are applicable, and in which a

career of prosperity is opened to the practitioner, should not have a corresponding "Faculty" arranged for it in the University, where an appropriate training—not practical and professional, but theoretical and scientific—might be had. Why should commerce and industry choose to remain under the stigma which the feudal system branded upon them, as base employments, which necessarily excluded from the education which was reserved for the territorial seigneur and the cleric? . . . What the re-arrangement of the faculties should be, and of the schools and courses leading up to their respective degrees, is matter which will require profound deliberation by special committees. Nor can it well be arranged by ourselves without the advice and co-operation of the Inns of Court, the Medical Council, the Heads of the Government Offices, and other chief interests and occupations, which will in future come in for their share of liberal training."¹

Pattison discussing the question of the division of time at Oxford between general and special studies, says: "Let school exercises—*i.e.* general education—terminate at Moderations. Let this examination be placed at the end of the first year from Matriculation. That passed, let the student declare his Faculty, and commence his special, or scientific, studies. These are to be according to a prescribed curriculum, for each Faculty separately, to be spread over two years and terminated by the Degree. . . . As I would remove Logic and Philology from Moderations, and make that examination an examination purely in scholarship, I would make the final examination for a degree in the Arts Faculty wholly scientific."² There follows a detailed criticism on "Greats" as they then were.

Incidentally Pattison makes a strong plea for the training of teachers by the University.³ He is also in favour of lengthening the terms. "Instead of three terms of residence in the year, I would have only two. The first should begin 10th October and end 23rd December. The second should begin 14th January and end 1st June.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 258-268.

² *Ib.* p. 311.

³ *Ib.* p. 287.

The examinations should be held once a year, in the month of May.”¹ Finally we come to the

Summary of Arrangement of Studies.

“A student would come up at once, without previous notice, and matriculate. All Matriculations are in October. He would inscribe his name on the register of the University, and not on the books of any College. All that would be necessary for this purpose would be that he should be presented at the Registry Office by an M.A. whose own name was on the roll of ‘Tutors’—*i.e.* the lowest or junior grade of University teachers. There is no Matriculation examination, no Responsions, and no ‘Pass’ examinations or lectures. The Tutor would give what instruction he thought fit, and require his pupils’ attendance at any courses of Professors’ Lectures he judged expedient.

“The student would lodge where he liked. If he chose to rent a set of rooms in any College, or if he obtained a Scholarship attached to any College, he would have, of course, to comply with such regulations as to hours, etc., as the College thought good to make. Outside College walls he would be amenable to the disciplinal regulations of the University and the directions of his Tutor.

“If he be a candidate for a degree, and for honours—which are the same thing—he must attend public lectures in such sequence as shall be from time to time directed by each of the Faculty Boards. The first University test he will encounter will be Moderations. There will be no limit of age or standing imposed on candidates for Moderations. But it would be usual to pass the Moderation-school at the end of the first year of residence—*i.e.* in the May following the October in which he matriculated. But there would be nothing to prevent any young man from offering himself for this examination before Matriculation. If he passed it, he would not thereby reduce the three years of his attendance on lectures to two, but he would gain the advantage of having got a mere ‘preliminary’ examination out of the way, and of getting three years’ scientific instruction instead of only two. In Moderations there would be (at least) two schools: (1)

¹ *Ib.* p. 315.

Classical; (2) Mathematical and Physical. Candidates to make their option between the Classical and the Mathematical School. . . .

“Having, after Moderations, chosen his Faculty, he must attend the courses of lectures in that faculty in the order prescribed by its Boards of Studies. Any other lectures besides these he is free to attend if he likes. If he intends to become a professional teacher, in or out of the University, his Tutor will recommend him to inscribe his name in the ‘Philological Seminary.’ These courses last two years. At the end of two years from Moderations he presents himself in the school of his Faculty for examination for the first degree. The faculties are:—

Theology.

Law, with two sub-faculties :

1. History.
2. Moral and Social Science.

Medicine.

Mathematics and Physics, in two sub-divisions :

1. Chemical and Biological Sciences.
2. Natural Philosophy.

Language and Literature, in three sub-divisions :

1. Comparative Philology and Science of Language.
2. Classics.
3. Theory and Archæology of Art.

Civil Engineering, Architecture, etc.

“The students who pass the examination which is instituted upon the courses will be entitled to the first degree. This degree confers the title of ‘Master’ and all the privileges and franchises attaching at present to a ‘Member of Convocation.’

“The second degree confers the title of Doctor of the Faculty to which the graduate belongs, but is only for those who design the practice of one of the professions. It is conferred by the University, but requires, besides the previous attainment of the degree of ‘Master’ in the Faculty, the performance of such exercises or conditions as the authorities of the profession may impose. . . . The Master’s degree is, alone, to qualify for the rank of Tutor. But before the ‘Tutor’ can be promoted to be ‘Lecturer’ in his Faculty, a further test might perhaps be applied.

At all events, attendance in the Philological Seminary would be required. . . . As soon as the University teachers shall be in a position to give instruction which is in itself valuable, we shall not grudge to admit all who will, freely to it, without exacting from them that they shall be candidates for a degree.”¹

Such were Pattison’s chief ideas on University Reform. In part they relate to machinery, and to the problem of organisation, but in the main, as he himself put it in his “Conclusion,” they amount to nothing less than “a change in the aims and objects of Oxford.” In other words, the author of them does not set before us a scheme capable of being carried out then and there, but sketches an ideal plan, embodying, as he put it, “a conception, which cannot be imported into Oxford from without, either by public opinion or the Legislature, because neither the public nor the Legislature can give an idea or a sentiment which they do not themselves possess. The idea, however, exists in germ in the University itself. It is sure to grow and develop itself under favourable influences. All that the Legislature can do is to create the conditions, or to remove the obstructions.”²

Another book of importance to the University reformer was published in this same year, 1868,—Professor Goldwin Smith’s “Reorganisation of the University of Oxford.” It is comparatively brief, but it contains much that is suggestive and informing. Goldwin Smith assumes, to start with, that the direct function of a University in the present day is education, and that educational duties ought to be attached to all emoluments. He will have nothing to do with Mark Pattison’s ideal. “It appears to me that the expenditure of public money in sinecures for the benefit of persons professedly devoted to learning and science has been decisively condemned by experience. . . . Experience seems to show that the best way in which the University can promote learning and advance science is by allowing its teachers, and especially the holders of its great Professorial chairs, a liberal margin for private study; by this, by keeping its libraries and scientific apparatus in

¹ *Ib.* pp. 317-322.

² *Ib.* p. 227.

full efficiency and opening them as liberally as possible, by assisting through its Press in the publication of learned works which an ordinary publisher would not undertake, and by making the best use of its power of conferring literary and scientific honours.”¹ And again, “in the same way the question whether particular Colleges shall devote themselves, wholly or principally, to particular studies, must be settled by the course of events; to canton the Colleges out at present among the different studies would be chimerical.”²

In his suggestions Goldwin Smith takes first the questions affecting the Colleges internally.

He is against the existing Fellowship System, and would divide the Fellowships into two classes—“Teacher Fellowships and Prize Fellowships; the former class, with the present or increased incomes, bound to strict residence and the performance of educational duties; the latter class, with reduced incomes, but without obligation to reside or other compulsory duty.” College government would be vested entirely in the Teaching Fellows. The Prize Fellows would be chosen by examination; but the Teacher Fellows by educational qualifications without limit in respect of age; so that the Colleges and the University would no longer be confined in their choice of teachers to those who had won a Fellowship immediately after taking the B.A. degree, to the exclusion of all whose educational powers may have been later developed.

As to the Prize Fellows, they should be elected only for a term of years.

“I would maintain students only during the educational course, including in that term the full period of professional as well as of liberal study, whether completed at Oxford, or, with the sanction of the University, elsewhere.”³

As for the Fellows forming the College staff, “provision ought to be made for its residence under the conditions of modern and domestic life in houses within or adjoining the College.”⁴

“The Headships ought now to have work assigned them suitable to the present circumstances and functions

¹ *Reorganisation*, pp. 1, 4. ² *Ib.* pp. 23, 24. ³ *Ib.* p. 16. ⁴ *Ib.* p. 17.

of the Colleges, *i.e.* the superintendence of moral discipline, and a share in the work of education.

“The time of persons devoted to education ought not to be spent in the management of estates. . . It would, in truth, be a good thing for the Colleges if their property were in the funds. . . It is in the direction, not so much of the lowering of charges as of improved economic machinery, that the economic reform of the Colleges may be hopefully pursued.”¹

“It seems to be generally acknowledged that the system under which each College attempts to be a University in itself must be abandoned, and that the Colleges must combine among themselves, and with the University Professoriate, for the purposes of instruction. . . The functions of the Tutor proper, that is, the personal superintendence of students, should be separated from those of the Lecturers; and the Lecturers should lecture, not to the College, but to the University, giving public notice of their courses like the Professors. The present Tutorial Fund should at the same time be divided; a portion paid to the Tutors, and the rest, through the College, to such Lecturers as the student may attend. The College may thus retain all desirable control over the instruction of its undergraduates. The position and prospects of College Lecturers themselves would obviously be greatly improved by the change.”²

The exact relations between the Professors and the College Lecturers cannot be determined beforehand: they will be settled among the Professors and Lecturers themselves, as experience may dictate. If instruction is reorganised on a University basis, the University Professor ought, in all cases, to have the first claim on the attendance of pupils; but otherwise the arrangements will probably vary in the different departments. Classics or Mathematics can be taught in a College Lecture-room, but Natural Science can only be taught in the Laboratories and Anatomy Schools of the University. In the same way the question whether particular Colleges shall devote themselves, wholly or principally, to particular studies, must be settled by the course of events: to canton

¹ *Ib.* pp. 19, 20.

² *Ib.* p. 21.

the Colleges out at present among the different studies is chimerical; it would imply a knowledge of the future of learning and science to which nobody, especially at a moment of critical transition, can pretend.”¹

“Shall we make the University again a place of professional study, or of study preliminary to professions, as well as a place of liberal education? In other words, shall we revive the Faculties? The analogy of all the Universities of other countries points to an answer in the affirmative. . . . The more practical parts of Law would still have to be learnt in London Chambers; the more practical parts of Medicine in London Hospitals. The University must for this purpose enter into alliance with the Inns of Courts and the Hospitals, and recognise their certificates as part qualifications for the legal and medical degrees. . . . With the Faculties, their old system of self-government should be revived, and they should be allowed, subject to the general legislation of the University, to regulate their own studies.”²

“I must concur in the opinion that the ‘Pass’ Examinations ought to cease; and that men who are unable, with reasonable industry, to reach the standard required for the lowest class in the Honour lists, ought not to be brought to the University.”³

“The Entrance Examination ought to be in the hands of the University, not only to secure the exclusion of men unprepared for Academical studies, . . . but also to put the requisite pressure on the public schools.”⁴

“That the Legislative Assembly of the University should be rightly constituted is a matter of the most vital importance. Upon this depends the fusion of the Colleges into a University, and their power of acting together for the common good. . . . The most indispensable, though perhaps the most difficult reform, is to set the intelligent and responsible government of the University free from the unintelligent and irresponsible interference of the non-Academical Convocation. The power of the non-residents is a usurpation; and it is not only a great anomaly, but a great evil. . . . The non-Academical element ought to be removed from Congre-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 23, 24. ² *Ib.* pp. 28, 29, 30. ³ *Ib.* p. 35. ⁴ *Ib.* p. 36.

gation, and the legislature of the University made, as it was intended to be, purely Academical. . . . If ballast, and a guarantee that Oxford shall not too much outrun public opinion, is really needed, a certain number of non-residents specially qualified, by having held important educational offices in the University or the Colleges, and possibly Head Masters of great Schools, might be added to Congregation.”¹

“The initiative Council . . . has not been successful. It has proved unable to act as a Cabinet, to shape any intelligible or consistent policy. . . . The other peculiarities of our system, the preposterous rule of discussing a measure on one day and voting on another, the absence of any power of moving amendments or of going into Committee on the details of a measure, are fatal to rational legislation. . . . The want of initiative vigour in the Council is evinced by their lazy retention of the fashion of legislating in bad Latin.”²

“In an active University, the Vice-Chancellor must always be a functionary of the highest importance, not only as regards executive government, but as regards general initiative. . . . The method of mere rotation among the Heads of Houses is clearly the offspring of the age of torpor, quite unsatisfactory at the present time.”³

“No Delegacy or Committee can be organic without a proper Secretary and a Chairman of its own. . . . The rule which makes the Vice-Chancellor *ex officio* Chairman of all Delegacies and Committees, and paralyses their action when he is absent (and perhaps still more when he is present) is too absurd, and too contrary to what common sense dictates elsewhere to require discussion.”⁴

“That English education will for some time to come need the organising and guiding control of a central authority, can hardly be doubted; and it seems equally clear that in a country governed by party, the Universities, if made thoroughly national, would be better and more trustworthy depositories of such authority than the political government. As there are two co-equal Universities, there would be little reason to apprehend a Procrustean despotism of education.”⁵ The day, however, seems

¹ *Ib.* pp. 38-40.

² *Ib.* pp. 40-42.

³ *Ib.* p. 42.

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 43, 44.

⁵ *Ib.* pp. 54, 56.

still far off when Oxford and Cambridge will supersede the Board of Education.

“The relations of the University and its component Colleges to the State also requires revision. At present the law is not quite certain, but it appears that though the University may be called to account for any technical breach of legality, there is no visitatorial authority to control the general exercise of its powers, or the general expenditure of its funds, in the interest of the nation. The Colleges have as Visitors mostly ecclesiastics. . . The Visitor, however, never visits in the proper sense of the term, nor does he in any way interfere to obviate the evils incident to perpetual endowments. He only hears appeals and interprets the Statutes. . . Everything seems to point to the creation of a responsible department of government with adequate powers for the visitation of endowed institutions. . . To this department of Government all powers now vested in the Privy Council or in Visitors, with regard to the amendment of Statutes or the appropriation of revenues, would naturally be transferred. . . Under an efficient system of Visitation, the expenditure of Academical funds for other than Academical purposes would of course be controlled.”¹

“The action of the State should, however, be limited to securing the right appropriation of public property, and the right use of public powers. There should be no interference with the intellectual liberty of the University. . . On the other hand, it is obviously necessary that the Universities should stand perfectly clear of political party. Their representation in Parliament, the well-meant but silly gift of James I., is not only an anomaly, but it is, under the guise of a privilege, a real curse. In the case of Oxford the representation has constantly placed the University in a position of subserviency to a political faction, and of antagonism to the nation. . . A University which does its duty and attaches the youth of the upper class to it by the bond of gratitude will always be sufficiently, perhaps more than sufficiently, represented in the House of Commons.”²

Such were the two chief Oxford contributions during

¹ *Ib.* pp. 61-64.

² *Ib.* pp. 64-66.

these years to the question of University Reform. The writers differ profoundly, yet they have much in common. Both desired a unified and self-governing University in touch with national education. Pattison had for his ideal an institution of the German pattern, which he would have secured by an amalgamation of the Colleges, a wholesale redistribution of their endowments, a graduated Professoriate, and a single-chambered government. It is not a little amusing to find him assuring us that the old quarrel of University *v.* Colleges is a dead issue, and then merging these institutions so completely the one in the other, that promotion for the teachers lies through the Colleges to the University and then back from the University to the Colleges. Pattison's University would also have claimed the student as its own from the outset, and have made the Colleges completely subservient to his interests. Goldwin Smith keeps in closer touch with the actual, and recognises that the function of the University is education. He would consolidate the Colleges but "without loss of their individuality, or of the emulation of which it is the spring, into a University," but he leaves their exact relations undefined; they must be settled by the light of further experience. He too would make Congregation the sole governing body, regarding this reform as of vital importance, because on it "depends the fusion of the Colleges into a University, and their power of acting together for the common good." The views held in common by two such diverse minds ought not lightly to be set on one side.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LEGISLATION OF THE SEVENTIES.

The abolition of University Tests is a striking example of a long-delayed reform. The great Parliament of 1832, in the fulness of its zeal and energy made the first attempt to deal with the matter. On the 17th of April, 1834, Colonel Williams moved the House of Commons to present an address to the King praying that subscription in the Universities might be abrogated except in the case of those persons who were proceeding to Degrees in Divinity. Thereupon Mr. George Wood proposed as an amendment that leave be given to bring in a Bill to grant to His Majesty's subjects generally the right of admission to the English Universities, and the right of equal eligibility to Degrees therein, notwithstanding their diversities of religious opinion, Degrees in Divinity alone excepted. On a division the amendment was carried by 185 votes to 44, and leave was given to bring in the Bill, which was read a second time on the 20th of June by 321 against 147. The third reading was carried on the 28th of July. Among the names of those who supported the measure may be found those of Mr. Secretary Spring Rice and Prof. Pryme, members for the Borough of Cambridge; Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Daniel O'Connell; while Mr. W. E. Gladstone, who had entered Parliament in 1832, spoke in opposition on the third reading. In the House of Lords the Earl of Radnor moved the second reading on the 1st of August. Viscount Melbourne and Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor, supported it, but the vote was Non-Contents, 187; Contents, 85, and there being no Parliament Act in those days, the Bill was lost. Lord Holland entered a protest against this decision of the Peers in the following vigorous language:—"Excellence in the learned and liberal professions of Law and Medicine in no degree depends on

religious belief; and Providence not having annexed the avowal of any peculiar tenets in religious matters as the condition of attaining human knowledge, I can discover no motive of prudence or duty which should induce human authority to impose any.”¹

The question of Tests came up again in the Parliament of 1835. On the 11th of June of that year the Earl of Radnor introduced a Bill into the House of Lords abolishing subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles on Matriculation. This modest proposal was defeated by 163 to 57 votes.

On the 25th of May, 1843, Mr. W. D. Christie, M.P. for Weymouth, moved the House of Commons for leave to bring in a Bill to abolish certain oaths and subscriptions in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and to extend education in the Universities to persons who were not members of the Church of England; but reaction had now set in, and on a division the motion was rejected by 175 to 105.

On the 19th of June, 1851, Mr. Heywood moved that the House of Commons should resolve itself into a Committee to consider the religious tests imposed by the authority of the Crown or by Act of Parliament as a qualification for any civil corporate privilege in the Universities and Colleges of Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin. Whilst Mr. Milner Gibson was speaking in favour of the motion, the House was counted out.

The modifications in tests effected by the University Acts of 1854 and 1856 have already been pointed out, and in this connexion the following extract will be read with interest. It is from the speech of the Earl of Derby, Chancellor of Oxford University, on the second reading of the Bill of 1854 in the House of Lords:—“If I thought that the effect of this (Bill) was in the slightest degree to dissociate the University and the Colleges from their close and intimate connexion with the Church of England—if I thought that it could in the slightest degree countenance any pretext on the part of the Dissenters, that for the purpose of accommodating their views the principles and the practices of the University were to be altered, I

¹ Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. IV., pp. 584, 585.

then should look upon this question in a very different light; and as I am desirous of removing the bar to their admission, so I am equally sincerely, cordially and determinedly opposed to the severance of the intimate and close connexion between the University and the Established Church. . . I never will sacrifice the inestimable advantage of having the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge as nurseries for the Church of England. . . I call upon Her Majesty's Ministers to declare that the Bill will not give to the Dissenter any control, power, or authority, over the discipline, teaching, or government of the University. I wish to learn from them how the degree of Bachelor of Arts is guarded in this respect, and I want to know further from them whether in sanctioning the granting of degrees of Bachelors to Dissenters, they do not give them a claim to be appointed to the masterships of many endowed schools in this country, where the object of the founder in requiring the masters to be Bachelors of Arts was practically for the purpose of securing that they should be members of the Church of England. As for the establishment of private Halls, although I am ready to admit that the intermixture of a small and unimportant portion of Dissenters among the Colleges, to whose rules they were subject, might be unobjectionable, I am not prepared to establish in these private Halls congregations of Dissenting young men in the centre of the University, or to encourage the propagation in Oxford, either of Protestant Dissent on the one hand, or the inculcation of Roman Catholic opinions on the other." The state of public opinion which such an utterance denotes, amply accounts for the apathy which the Whig Ministers displayed towards the Nonconformist grievance, and the despair of such men as Mr. Bright, Mr. Miall and Mr. Heywood, as to the possibility of securing redress.

The further efforts made after 1856 must be passed over very briefly. Suffice it to say that from 1864 onwards a University Tests Bill was a "hardy annual" in the House of Commons. The Bill of 1867 was rejected by the House of Lords, as was the Bill of 1869. The real debate on the subject took place in 1870. On May 23rd of that year, the Solicitor-General, Sir John Duke

Coleridge, moved the second reading of the University Tests Bill.¹ The Government had now advanced to the position previously occupied by the more Radical members of the party, and had incorporated in their proposals the amendment moved by Mr. Fawcett to the Bill of the previous year, the effect of which was, that instead of the abolition of the tests being left to the various Colleges, to be adopted by them or not at their pleasure, those tests were abolished for them once for all by the power of Parliament. Mr. Spencer Walpole, one of the members for the University of Cambridge, moved the rejection of the Bill. Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, in supporting it, thus summarised the facts: "Only after the Reformation did the fatal idea creep in of fastening the Universities in the strait waistcoat of orthodoxy. King Edward VI weeded out the Catholics, Queen Mary weeded them in again. Queen Elizabeth weeded them out a second time; and after much vacillation, owing to the various interests which alternately influenced her mind, she inflicted on Oxford the Thirty-nine Articles and the three Articles of the 36th Canon. This was done at the advice of Leicester, an incompetent general, a more than incompetent statesman, and the murderer of his wife. King James inflicted the three Articles of the 36th Canon on Cambridge. But it was not till the Restoration that the Universities experienced their full degradation. By the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. it was ordered that Heads and Fellows of Colleges, Professors, Lecturers and Tutors should be required to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. The century and a-half after the Act of Uniformity was the darkest and dreariest period in the history of the Universities. They became a by-word, not only in England but on the Continent. They were the home of Jacobite Toryism; they published declarations against civil and religious liberty—on one occasion in such language that the declaration was ordered to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, and that order came from the House of Lords. Of educational

¹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. CCI., p. 1192, and following volumes.

work there was little or none, and religion showed its presence chiefly by those libations of port wine of which Gibbon preserved so keen a recollection." Mr. Gladstone followed on the same side, agreeing with Sir Robert Peel that "it was impossible to admit Dissenters to education at the Universities without admitting them to degrees, that it was impossible to admit them to degrees without admitting them to government, and impossible to admit them to government without admitting them to emoluments." The first two points had been conceded; the second two followed of necessity. The second reading was carried by 191 to 66, a majority of 125, and the third reading by a still larger majority.

In the House of Lords the second reading was moved on July 14 by Earl de Grey and Ripon, afterwards known as the Marquis of Ripon. The Marquis of Salisbury met the proposal by a hostile amendment which was carried by a majority of 14, and a Select Committee was appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the best mode of giving effect thereto. This action killed the Bill for that session, but the discussions which had taken place materially shortened the proceedings in 1871.

Mr. Gladstone, when once he had reached a position, never went back from it; and though as late as 1865 he had opposed Mr. Goschen's Bill for the abolition of tests at Oxford, he was now determined that the oft-repeated demands of the Nonconformists should in great measure be granted, and he went forward without wavering. On February 10th, 1871, he re-introduced the Bill of the year before, refusing to enlarge it so as to include clerical Fellowships and Headships, on the ground that it was the duty of the Government to make one more appeal to the House of Lords to pass the measure which it had rejected the year before. Six days later the Bill was read a second time without a division. On February 20th it passed through Committee without amendment, and was read a third time without a division on February 23rd. This rapid progress showed that all parties in the Commons were ready for a settlement.

The House of Lords gave the Bill a first reading on the same day as it passed the House of Commons. The real struggle was in Committee. The Marquis of Salis-

bury, in accordance with the advice of the Select Committee appointed the year before, proposed the following addition to Clause 2: "No person shall be appointed to the office of Tutor, Assistant Tutor, Dean, Censor, or Lecturer in Divinity, in any College now subsisting in the said Universities, until he shall have made and subscribed the following Declaration in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, that is to say: 'I A. B. do solemnly declare that while holding the office of —— I will not teach anything contrary to the teaching or divine authority of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.'" The noble Marquis declared that "the question raised by this Bill is not a question between Church and Dissent, but between Christianity and infidelity."¹ Personally he and his friends desired that all honours and emoluments, all Fellowships and Scholarships should be thrown open without distinction to all subjects of the Queen. They held, however, that the office of teaching rested upon a very different footing to the enjoyment of emoluments, the rights of the pupils had to be considered, education must be religious, and the amendments to be proposed were directed mainly to the maintenance of religious education. The amendment was carried by 71 to 66, a majority of only 5, and other amendments on the same lines were carried by equally narrow majorities. Mr. Gladstone, on the return of the Bill to the Commons, would have none of Lord Salisbury's "negative test," and declared that it was impossible to have such a test more unfortunately framed than that introduced by the Lords. The amendment was disagreed with without a division, as were similar amendments. The Lords did not carry the contest further. The motion to insist on the Salisbury clause was lost by a majority of 40. After this vote it was useless to persevere, and the Royal Assent was given to the Bill on June 16th, thirty-seven years after Mr. Ward had made the first attempt.

¹ Most political struggles generate catch-words. The catch-word about the abolition of University Tests was that "it was opening the flood-gates of infidelity." The present defenders of the last shred of religious tests now remaining at Oxford,—those for the Divinity Degrees, do not seem to have advanced very far from the position occupied by Lord Salisbury more than forty years ago.

We may now turn to the text of the Act itself. The first paragraph of the Preamble runs as follows:—

“Whereas it is expedient that the benefits of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, and of the Colleges and Halls now subsisting therein, as places of religion and learning, should be rendered freely accessible to the nation:” It is here laid down that not only the Universities, but the Colleges as well are henceforth to be regarded as national institutions.

The operative clause is Clause 3. It runs: “No person shall be required, upon taking, or to enable him to take, any degree (other than a degree in Divinity) within the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham, or any of them, or upon exercising or to enable him to exercise, any of the rights and privileges which may heretofore have been, or may hereafter be, exercised by graduates in the said Universities, or any of them, or in any College subsisting at the time of the passing of this Act in any of the said Universities, or upon taking, or holding, or to enable him to take or hold, any office in any of the said Universities or any such College as aforesaid, or upon teaching, or to enable him to teach, or upon opening, or to enable him to open, a private Hall or Hostel for the reception of students, to subscribe any article or formulary of faith, or to make any declaration, or to take any oath respecting his religious belief or profession, or to attend, or abstain from attending, any form of public worship, or to belong to any specified church, sect, or denomination; nor shall any person be compelled to attend the public worship of any church, sect, or denomination to which he does not belong.”

The word “office” is previously defined in Clause 2 as including “every Professorship other than Professorships of Divinity, every Assistant or Deputy Professorship, Prælectorship, Lectureship, Headship of a College or Hall, Fellowship, Studentship, Tutorship, Scholarship, or Exhibition.”

The throwing open of all rights and privileges enabled Nonconformists to vote as members of the Senate, and consequently to take their full share in the government of the University. Clause 3, combined with Clause 2, threw open all Headships, Professorships, Lectureships,

Fellowships and Scholarships, save where a clerical qualification was expressly attached to them. This exception was effected by the saving sections of Clause 3. Compulsory attendance at College Chapel was also done away with for those who were not members of the Church of England.

This same year was rendered notable by another step in advance. On October 24th, 1871, Mr. Gladstone addressed a letter to the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge which began as follows:—

“REV. SIR,—I have the honour to acquaint you that during the discussions of the current year upon the University Tests Act, the advisers of the Crown made known to Parliament their opinion that a complete enquiry ought to be instituted, by a Commission for the purpose, into the revenues and property of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and their intention to take steps with a view to the early appointment of such a Commission.

“On the one hand it appeared to be undeniable that the information to be sought through such a Commission would be of great interest and value to the public and to Parliament, as well as to the members of the two distinguished bodies themselves. On the other hand, the Government bore in mind that it had not been in the power of a Royal Commission of inquiry, appointed more than twenty years ago, to present such information in a complete form even at the period of their investigation; while the time which has intervened must have greatly altered the facts of the case in a variety of material particulars.

“What thus remained wanting could only be supplied either under the authority of a Statutory Commission, or through a Royal Commission, if such Royal Commission should enjoy the full and free assistance of the Universities and Colleges themselves.”

Mr. Gladstone then remarked that from inquiries which had been made, it was thought a Royal Commission would meet the needs of the case. He continued:—

“With regard to the scope of the inquiry which has been mentioned in Parliament, it ought, in our view, to embrace the fullest information respecting all matters of

fact connected with the property and income either of the Universities themselves, or of the Colleges and Halls therein. In these would be included the prospects of increase or decrease in such property and income, and the statement of the uses to which they are applied. But it would be no part of the duty of the Commission to pass judgment on the present appropriation of these resources, or to recommend alterations in it. For a task thus defined, in the opinion of the Government, a single Commission, composed of a small number of members, would suffice; and it is to be hoped that the inquiry need not occupy more than a moderate space of time.

“What is requisite, however, is that the Government should have reasonable ground to expect such voluntary and general assistance from the numerous societies concerned as would warrant their relying on a process thus conducted for the attainment of complete results.” Finally Mr. Gladstone asked the Vice-Chancellor to ascertain how such a Commission would be regarded by the University and the Colleges. The reply in both cases was that every facility and assistance would be afforded in order to render the inquiry effectual.¹

On January 5, 1872, a Royal Commission was issued, the Commissioners being the Duke of Cleveland, Lord Frederick Cavendish, Lord Clinton, J. W. Strutt (afterwards Lord Rayleigh), W. H. Bateson, Bartholomew Price, and K. D. Hodgson. Mr. C. S. Roundell was appointed Secretary. The Commissioners presented their Report on July 31st, 1874. Details from it and comment on it are reserved for Chapter XI, which treats of the Financial Resources of the two Universities.

In the Appendix to the Report will be found various matters of wider scope. There are here the memorials and other documents which show the origin of the University Extension Movement (pp. I.-XI.).

There is also a memorandum addressed to Mr. Gladstone which runs as follows:—

“We, the undersigned, being resident Fellows of Colleges and other Resident members of the University of Cambridge, engaged in educational work or holding

¹ *Report*, p. 23.

offices in the University or the Colleges, thinking it of the greatest importance that the Universities should retain the position which they occupy as the centres of the highest education, are of opinion that the following reforms would increase the educational efficiency of the University, and at the same time promote the advancement of science and learning.

“I. No Fellowship should be tenable for life, except only when the original tenure is extended in consideration of services rendered to education, learning, or science, actively and directly, in connection with the University or the Colleges.

“II. A permanent professional career should be as far as possible secured to resident educators and students, whether married or no(t).

“III. Provision should be made for the association of the Colleges, or of some of them, for educational purposes, so as to secure more efficient teaching and to allow to the teachers more leisure for private study.

“IV. The pecuniary and other relations subsisting between the University and the Colleges should be revised, and, if necessary, a representative Board of University finance should be organised.

“We are of opinion that a scheme may be framed which shall deal with these questions in such a manner as to promote simultaneously the interests of education and of learning, and that any scheme by which those interests should be dissociated would be injurious to both.”

In the covering letter sent with the memorial there occurs the following sentence:—

“It is universally admitted that the present regulations connected with the tenure of Fellowships are highly unsatisfactory. They seriously diminish the number of learned residents in Cambridge. They are detrimental to the efficiency of teaching in the University, and calculated to deprive her of the educational services of many of her ablest members.”

Mr. Gladstone replied in a letter dated April 28th, 1873, in which he says: “It gives me great pleasure to find supported by this authoritative judgment a proposal with respect to the tenure of Fellowships, the principle of

which was included in the Oxford University Bill of 1854, but from which the state of Parliamentary and academic opinion at the time compelled the Government of Lord Aberdeen to withdraw." Mr. Gladstone adds that the time is hardly ripe for action, but assures the memorialists that the subject is one which will always command his warm and friendly interest.

In January, 1874, Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country. At the ensuing General Election he was defeated, and on February 17th he resigned office. When therefore the Royal Commission reported on the last day of July, 1874, the Conservatives had for some months been installed in office, and by one of the ironies of politics it fell to them to carry out their predecessors' policy in the matter of University Reform. Mark Pattison has left us the following lively explanation of a unique situation as it appeared to him in 1876, the year before legislation actually took place. "In 1854," he writes,¹ "the House of Commons, after many threats and long hesitation, made its onslaught on the Universities, or rather on the Colleges. It was a fair stand-up fight between these wealthy and powerful societies and the representatives of the nation. The issue may be said to have been a drawn battle. The Colleges were not re-modelled, nor did they lose a shilling of their property. On the other hand, the assailant made good his claim to overhaul and to legislate. Everyone felt that this first baffled attempt was but a prelude. We are now (1876) in the middle of the second Punic War, and no one can fail to see the importance of the advantage gained by the attacking party in the first. In 1854 we disputed the right of interference, and invoked our charters and the sacredness of private property. This ground is no longer taken. The cry of 'spoliation' is no longer raised. We take as a matter of course the taking away of the property of the Colleges and giving it to the University, and no one is shocked or so much as hints at 'confiscation.' . . All parties are agreed that the Colleges shall be wholly re-modelled. There is no fight about this. The struggle will be what model shall be adopted. . .

¹ *Essays on the Endowment of Research*, pp. 2-3, 11-15.

What then are the causes of dissatisfaction? What is it that has led to the call for a new Reform Bill? From what side does the present movement, which Lord Salisbury's Bill is intended to satisfy, come?

"The question is not so easy to answer as might be thought. I have asked over and over again, Why should a Conservative Government have meddled with the University at all? It is not part of the Tory programme to promote science, to foster intelligence, to raise the level of education. Property, character, respectability, Church principle, obedience to superiors, these have been the basis on which Toryism has rested, these are the valuable qualities it has fostered, and to the production of which it would fain direct its education. In its adhesion to this programme lay the strength of Conservatism. How is it that it should have deserted its traditional ground, and taken up the policy of the Liberal party? Twenty years ago the very title of 'Professor' was odious to the Conservatives, who used all their strength, and successfully, to prevent the employment of College funds for the endowment of Professorial chairs. Now in 1876, when the Universities were working better than they had ever done, when there was no public dissatisfaction, no call whatever for interposition, a Conservative Government comes down upon us with a Bill, the object of which, so far as we can discover its object, is to promote that very kind of reform which twenty years ago it employed all its strength to defeat—the confiscation, viz., of College property for the benefit of the University. . . . It cannot be alleged that there was any pressure of opinion from without which called for a further University reform. The Bill of the present Ministry is a legacy from the 'harassing' legislation of their predecessors. . . . According to the opinion of the middle classes of England, Oxford is a place of education. We ourselves, *i.e.* the Colleges, have no other conception of our vocation. Meanwhile a vague notion was being spread that these societies, which existed only for education, were possessed of large landed or other property. The central Government wished to know how much? It asked us to tell in 1851, but we yelled and screamed, and threw dust in the air, and got off telling for the moment. The question was

repeated in 1874, and in sterner and more determined tones. The howling this time was confined to the Bursars of the Colleges. These gentlemen were certainly hardly used, in being required to make laborious returns upon schedules quite unnecessarily complicated. But it will be observed that the Colleges this time showed no reluctance to produce their rent-rolls. The public, as usual, in the absence of information, had indulged in exaggeration. We paid the just penalty of having refused in 1851 to make any return, in being now credited with extravagant riches. In 1874 we were rather anxious to disabuse general opinion by letting it be known how moderate our incomes really were.

“The return was made. It was ascertained that the nett income of the University and Colleges of Oxford was £400,000 a year. To combine this fact, or figure, with the other fact or figure that Oxford is a place for the education of 2,000 students, required no great powers of logic. It was a sum in division. Divide the pounds sterling by the students, and it is obvious that each undergraduate costs £200 a year to educate. To educate, observe; simply teachers’ fees; for the pupil pays himself for his board, lodging, all his necessities and amusements. The teaching power, for 2,000 undergraduates, staff, apparatus, chapels, libraries, Deans, Tutors, Heads, Prize-Fellowships, who all exist for the sake of the undergraduate, cost £400,000 a year. This is a striking, not to say staggering result. If the lower and uneducated classes should ever come to an apprehension of these figures, how must they reason upon them? ‘This annual sum arises out of national property. National property belongs to us. We are even told by some that it was given by the founders to the poor students. It is all spent upon educating the sons of the rich.’ It is certain that as information slowly finds its way downwards, this simple reasoning must come into vogue. Meanwhile, so far as the figures have been reflected on by the classes at present interested in the Universities, the conviction has arisen that there is something wrong here. The expenses of this educational establishment are out of all proportion to the work done. We have not so much fault to find with the teaching, but it is too expensive. £400,000 a year for ‘tuition, prizes

and the use of the globes' is too much. It can be done cheaper.

"If this is a true description, first of the actual reasoning of the middle classes, and secondly of the prospective reasoning of the lower classes, it becomes intelligible why a Conservative Government should have found it necessary to take the initiative and endeavour to obviate the economic objection to Oxford. The objection of its extravagant cost is not the only objection that can be brought, but it is the only one which is urged with any effect, or which can be adequately apprehended by the middle class of an industrial community with little education and no culture. The sum in arithmetic—divide the pounds by the pupils—that is an argument by which 'the constituencies' are capable of being moved. It is an act of statesmanship to anticipate this movement, and to deal with 'surplus funds' of the Colleges before they are seized by ignorant hands. I offer this as a conjectural history of Lord Salisbury's Bill."

When Parliament assembled on February 8th, 1876, it was announced in the Queen's Speech that legislation would be proposed relating to the Universities. Accordingly on February 24th the Marquis of Salisbury, who was then Secretary of State for India, rose to present the University of Oxford Bill. After premising that there were not many in the House who could remember the last University Bill, he continued: "It may be worth while, therefore, before entering on the consideration of another University Bill to remind your Lordships of the principles embodied in the Act of 1854. And what were they? . . . The principal portion of the Act was directed to the entire reconstruction of the Government and legislative machinery of the University. With respect to that portion of the Act, I have no proposition to make. Another point which at the time was considered to be of great importance was . . . that provision in the Act which gave leave to Masters of Arts to set up Halls. . . The result has been that one Master set up a Hall; and that there are four undergraduates in it. That is the end of all those hopes and all those fears. Some twelve years afterwards the University devised a plan of its own to admit the less wealthy

classes to the training of the University. It devised what is known as the system of Unattached Students. The result which seven years' experience of that system enables the University to present is very remarkable. In 1868-9, when it commenced, the entries of undergraduates as Unattached Students was 53; and from that time they have gone on increasing year by year, so that in 1875 they were 185, which is, I think, a very respectable number. . . . A third point in the Act of 1854 was the application of the revenues of the Colleges. In respect of that, undoubtedly, there has not been the same satisfaction as has been derived from the other points with which the Act dealt. There are constant complaints that the revenues of the University are not spent in as useful a manner as they might be, and that things remain undone which might be done if there were a more judicious outlay of some portion of those revenues. This it was which led to the appointment of the Commission presided over by the Duke of Cleveland, whose inquiry was to be as to the revenues of the Colleges as they at present exist, and as they might be expected to exist at a definite time. That Commission reported towards the close of 1874. In one sense it was a most satisfactory Report. It showed that the idea—if the idea ever existed—that the Colleges mismanaged their property was wholly without foundation. . . . But, on the other hand, the Commissioners go on to notice, as one remarkable thing arising out of their inquiry, a point to which it would have been impossible not to direct the attention of Parliament. One point brought prominently out in the result of the inquiry is the great disparity between the property and income of the several Colleges and the number of the members. When that number is small the expense of the staff and establishment is large in proportion. And now let me explain why we undertook to legislate on the University at all. It is a work I undertook with great reluctance, and I do not think Her Majesty's Government would have entered upon it at all, if they had not felt that there was an absolute necessity for their so doing. It is not desirable, if it can be avoided, that the interference of Parliament should be invoked, because

such interference is calculated to disturb the studies of the University and to excite hopes that cannot be realised. But when we come to look at certain figures and the deductions that lay in those figures, we felt that it would be idle to think that Parliament could abstain from interfering, or that we could conscientiously recommend Parliament to do so. I will venture to put before your Lordships what I know are hostile figures. . . . In the first place, it is calculated that within the next 15 years an addition of no less than £123,000 a year will be made to the Collegiate revenues. . . . Again, it is not only the prospective income of the Colleges which is to be regarded—we have an actual income to examine. Taking together the whole corporate income and tuition fees, but deducting money borrowed and money received on behalf of the University, and other necessary deductions, it appears that the average income per undergraduate in all the Colleges is £203. But when we come from the Colleges as a whole to particular Colleges we have very different results. The income per undergraduate in all the Colleges is £203; but in Exeter it is only £97, in Trinity £96, and in Balliol £75. If University education were provided in all the Colleges as cheaply as at Exeter, there would be at present a saving annually of £165,578; as cheaply as at Trinity, there would be a saving annually of £167,129; or as cheaply as at Balliol, a saving annually of £197,700. With such figures before us, on the surface of the Report, I hold that it would be impossible to avoid dealing with the question. . . . It may be urged that the Colleges individually may come and ask to have the necessary legislative changes. But another and great complaint is that, while the Colleges are rich, the University is poor, and you cannot expect that the result of an application by each College would be a scheme which would work economically for the whole. You might as well expect economy and good order to result from the proceedings of twenty different architects building a club-house, each of whom came forward with a plan of one room in the club-house to suit his own views. But where does the money go? The £200,000 is not thrown into the sea. With a great number of different bodies, some large and some small, of

course the expense of the small bodies will be out of proportion to that of the large ones. The real gist of the whole question lies in the Fellowships, and in the giving men £250 to £300 a year without any duties attached to the Fellowships in right of which they receive that amount. I do not believe that any one starting fresh in the matter would ever think of establishing rewards of that kind. . . Only in this case of Fellowships to which no duties are attached do you reward merit by absolute idleness. It is against the whole law of public life. In public life, if a man succeeds, you give him more important work, but not idleness. In the Bill of 1854 the authors of that Bill saw the evil and endeavoured to provide against it. They suggested that there should be work attached to those Fellowships. But there was great opposition. In the end Commissioners were appointed; and the Commissioners, though they wished to make a fundamental alteration, did not care to make an effectual alteration. I am afraid they adopted a compromise maintaining the appearance of one system while adopting another. At all events it is a comfort to know that the University has become thoroughly alive to the evil of this state of things, and from it we shall meet with no opposition in applying such remedy as may be thought necessary. It seems that if all these 'idle Fellowships' were to be done away with, we should save a sum of from £50,000 to £60,000 or £80,000. That, under an improved system, could be applied to University purposes. There are now from 220 to 230 of these Fellowships not filled by any person occupying an educational office. At £250 per Fellow that would give a disposable sum of £55,000 a year. These are the monies we have got in hand. First I would ask what are the objects to which it is desirable that these revenues should be applied? . . I should suggest that the recommendations of the Committee of the Hebdomadal Council would afford a good indication of present requirements. The Committee speaks of a new library, new museums, and new schools. . . I think I may estimate that a capital sum amounting, on the whole, to £210,000 would be required for these objects. Besides this the Committee press strongly the necessity of increased remuneration for those who are

engaged in academical education. There are Professors at £800, £600, £300, £200, and even at £100. Compare these annual stipends with what is paid in other departments. . . I do not believe that less than £1000 a-year, with a fair pension beside, will secure the highest talent for those Professorships. . . My Lords, these being the objects we have in view, it may be well to state what money we hold to be available. In the Report of the Commissioners a distinction is drawn between the general income of the Colleges and the money held by them in trust. We propose to interfere very little with trusts. . . But beside the trust funds there would still remain a vast residue of revenue over which the Commissioners would be able to exercise control and to apply to such purposes as they thought best. . . We propose now to begin at the point where the Act of 1854 ended. We propose to provide by means of the present Bill that each College shall have the opportunity during some eighteen or twenty months after the passing of the Act of drawing up and of laying statutes before the Commissioners to be appointed under the Bill, and on such statutes receiving the approval of the Commissioners they shall become law. . . All I have to do now is to show what duties the Commissioners will have to perform. We propose that in dealing with the University the Commissioners may make provision from time to time for affording further or better instruction in Art or Science; for providing endowments for Professorships or Lectureships; for erecting and endowing Professorships or Lectureships on arts or sciences not already taught in the University; for providing new or improving existing buildings, libraries and museums, and collections and apparatus. The proposal with regard to the Colleges is somewhat similar, and also provides that College revenues may be applied to the maintenance and benefit of persons of known ability and learning, who may be engaged in study or research in the realms of Art and Science in the University." Lord Salisbury then went on to speak of the duty and necessity of encouraging research, and concluded the most radical speech he ever made in these words: "We feel in the present chaos of opinion, at a time when beliefs of all kinds and on

all subjects appear to be loosening their hold, it is of especial value to give every facility to, and to take every opportunity of maintaining in their fullest efficiency, institutions which combine those dispositions of mind on which alone any sound and progressive culture can rest."

An interesting feature of the brief discussion which followed was a speech by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, as Dr. Tait, had been one of the leading spirits of the Oxford Commission of 1850. He remarked that "looking to the past, he could not conceal from himself that it was desirable that a little external pressure should be brought to bear upon the Universities, and that it would not do to trust either the Universities or the Colleges with the entire management of the reforms, for he believed that they were not an exception to the rule which had been found to exist everywhere, that hardly any corporation was capable of entirely reforming itself without external pressure."¹

The second reading of the Bill was carried on March 9th. Speaking for the Government, the Earl of Carnarvon remarked: "It must never be forgotten that originally at Oxford the University was the chief and central figure, but changes had occurred, and at Oxford the supremacy had passed into the hands of the Colleges, and in restoring a little of the power which originally belonged to the University, they were but reverting to an old idea, but a sound one in theory and practice."² The Marquis of Salisbury, on the other hand, on March 31st, on the motion to go into Committee, said plainly: "The interests of the Colleges would be attended to first, and those of the University afterwards."

In Committee the Earl of Morley carried the following amendment: "The Commissioners may also, on the application of any two or more Colleges, make provision for their complete or partial union; such application shall be made by at least two-thirds of the Governing Bodies of the said Colleges, with the consent of the

¹ Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. CCXXVII., pp. 791-806.

² *Ib.* p. 1683.

Visitors thereof." The Marquis of Salisbury afterwards embodied this amendment in a new clause, which appears as Clause 22 in the Act.

Lord Carlingford was unsuccessful with the following clause, intended to give Oxford the same constitution as Mr. Gladstone intended by the Bill of 1854:—"On and after the 15th day of Michaelmas Term, 1876, the Congregation of the University of Oxford shall be composed of the following persons only, the said persons being members of Convocation: The Chancellor, the High Steward, the Heads of Colleges and Halls, the Proctors, the Members of the Hebdomadal Council, the officers named in the schedule to this list annexed, the Professors, Lecturers and Readers of the University, the Public Examiners, Resident Fellows of Colleges, and all persons who shall be certified by the Head of any College or Hall to be engaged in the tuition, discipline, or administration of such College or Hall."

The Bill was passed and sent to the Commons on May 5th, and was read a second time on June 12th.

The University of Cambridge Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Spencer Walpole on May 16th, and was read a second time on July 6th, after an amendment moved by Sir Charles Dilke: "That in view of the large legislative powers entrusted to the University of Cambridge Commissioners, this House is of opinion that the Bill does not sufficiently declare or define the principles and scope of the changes which such Commissioners are empowered to make in that University and the Colleges therein." This amendment was identical in terms with that which Mr. Osborne Morgan had previously moved on the Oxford Bill. The idea which was in the mind of the Opposition may be expressed in one sentence from Sir Charles Dilke's speech: "Their complaint was, that as far as any limitations went, the Bill enabled the Commissioners to strip the Colleges in order to make a couple of bad copies of a German University." It is noteworthy that Sir Charles Dilke, a Cambridge man and a Radical, was for the Colleges against the University, and that the Radical section of the Liberal Party agreed with him. Both Bills were withdrawn on July 31st.

The Queen's Speech for 1877 again contained a promise

of University legislation. This time the two Bills were made into one, and on February 9th Mr. Gathorne Hardy brought in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge Bill. On February 19th the Bill was read a second time without a division. In Committee Sir Charles Dilke again raised the question of University government. He proposed to give powers to the Commissioners "for altering the qualifications required for membership of Congregation at Oxford, and for admission to the Electoral Roll of the University of Cambridge, and for limiting or abrogating the power of the Convocation of the University of Oxford and of the Senate of the University of Cambridge respectively to regulate matters relating to the studies of the University, and to the education given in it." The amendment was lost by a majority of 28. A long debate took place on the question of Clerical Fellowships, Mr. Goschen moving: "The Commissioners, in Statutes made by them for a College, shall provide that the entering into or being in Holy Orders shall not be the condition of the holding of any Headship or Fellowships." The Government view was that the question should be left to the Commissioners. The discussion drew Mr. Gladstone from the retirement in which he had lived since his defeat in 1874, and he supported Mr. Goschen, who was defeated by a majority of only nine. The Bill was read a third time on June 18th. The Lords made certain amendments, but an agreement between the two Houses was speedily reached, and the Royal Assent was given on August 10th.

The Preamble of the Act runs as follows:—

"Whereas the revenues of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are not adequate to the full discharge of the duties incumbent on them respectively, and it is therefore expedient that provision be made for enabling or requiring the Colleges in each University to contribute more largely out of their revenues to the University purposes, especially with a view to further and better instruction in Art, Science, and other branches of learning, where the same are not taught, or not adequately taught in the University:

"And whereas it may be requisite for the purposes aforesaid, as regards each University, to attach Fellow-

ships and other emoluments held in the Colleges to offices in the University :

“And whereas it is also expedient to make provision for regulating the tenure and advantages of Fellowships not so attached, and for altering the conditions on which the same are held, and to amend in divers other particulars the law relating to the Universities and Colleges :”

By Clauses 3 and 4 two bodies of Commissioners were appointed, styled respectively the University of Oxford Commissioners and the University of Cambridge Commissioners.

The following were the Oxford Commissioners:—Lord Selborne, the Earl of Redesdale, Dr. Montagu Bernard, Sir William Grove, Dr. James Bellamy, Professor H. J. S. Smith, and Matthew White Ridley.

The Cambridge Commissioners were Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, The Bishop of Worcester, Lord Rayleigh, the Right Hon. E. P. Bouverie, Professor Lightfoot, Professor Stokes, and G. W. Hemming.

The powers of the Commissioners were continued till the end of 1880, with power to the Queen in Council to extend the time till the end of 1881. The Commissioners from and after the end of 1878 had the power of making Statutes for the Universities and Colleges, and the Universities and Colleges had the like power, subject to the approval of the Commissioners. The effect of this proviso was that if a University or College did not frame statutes to the Commissioners' liking, the Commissioners could frame Statutes for it, but they could not alter a trust less than fifty years old (Clause 13), and were required to have regard to the main design of founders.

The objects of Statutes for the University are thus set out (Clause 16) :—

“With a view to the advancement of Art, Science, and other branches of learning, the Commissioners, in Statutes made by them for the University, may from time to time make provision for the following purposes or any of them:

“(1) For enabling and requiring the several Colleges, or any of them, to make contribution out of their revenues for University purposes, regard being first had to the wants of the several Colleges in themselves for educational and other Collegiate purposes :

“(2) For the creation, by means of contributions from the Colleges or otherwise of a common University Fund, to be administered under the supervision of the University:

“(3) For making payments under the supervision of the University, out of the said common fund, for the giving of instruction, the doing of work, or the conducting of investigations within the University or inquiry connected with the studies of the University:

“(4) For consolidating any two or more Professorships or Lectureships:

“(5) For erecting and endowing Professorships or Lectureships:

“(6) For abolishing Professorships or Lectureships:

“(7) For altering the endowment of any Professorship or Lectureship:

“(8) For altering the conditions of eligibility or appointment and mode of election or appointment to any Professorship or Lectureship, and for limiting the tenure thereof:

“(9) For providing retiring pensions for Professors and Lecturers:

“(10) For providing new or improving existing buildings, libraries, collections, or apparatus for any purpose connected with the instruction of any members of the University, or with research in any art or science or other branch of learning, and for maintaining the same:

“(11) For diminishing the expense of University education by founding Scholarships tenable by students either at any College or Hall within the University or as unattached students not members of any College or Hall, or by paying salaries to the teachers of such unattached students, or by otherwise encouraging such unattached students¹:

“(12) For founding and endowing Scholarships, Exhibitions, and Prizes for encouragement of proficiency in any art or science or other branch of learning:

¹ This sub-section embodies an amendment proposed by Dr. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury.

“(13) For modifying the trusts, conditions, or directions of or affecting any University endowment, foundation, or gift, or of or affecting any Professorship, Lectureship, Scholarship, office, or institution, in or connected with the University, or of or affecting any property belonging to or held in trust for the University or held by the University in trust for a Hall, as far as the Commissioners think the modification thereof necessary or expedient for giving effect to Statutes made by them for any purpose in this Act mentioned :

“(14) For regulating presentations to benefices in the gift of the University :

“(15) For regulating the application of the purchase money for any advowson sold by the University :

“(16) For founding any office not paid out of University or College funds in connexion with any special educational work done out of the University under the control of the University, and for remunerating any secretary or officer resident in the University and employed there in the management of any such special educational work :

“(17) For altering or repealing any Statute, Ordinance or regulation of the University and substituting or adding any Statute for or to the same.”

Clause 17 reads: “The Commissioners in Statutes made by them for a College, may from time to time make provision for the following purposes relative to the College, or any of them :

“(1) For altering and regulating the conditions of eligibility or appointment including where it seems fit those relating to age, to any emolument or office held in or connected with the College, the mode of election and appointment thereto, and the value, length, and conditions of tenure thereof, and for providing a retiring pension for a holder thereof :

“(2) For consolidating any two or more emoluments held in or connected with the College :

“(3) For dividing, suspending, suppressing, converting or otherwise dealing with any emolument held in or connected with the College :

“(4) For attaching any emolument held in or connected with the College to any office in the College, on

such tenure as to the Commissioners seems fit, and for attaching to the emolument, in connexion with the office, conditions of residence, study, and duty, or any of them :

“(5) For affording further or better instruction in any art or science or other branch of learning :

“(6) For providing new or improving existing buildings, libraries, collections, or apparatus, for any purpose connected with instruction or research in any art or science or other branch of learning, and for maintaining the same :

“(7) For diminishing the expense of education in the College :

“(8) For modifying the trusts, conditions, or directions affecting any College endowment, foundation, or gift, or any property belonging to the College, or the Head or any member thereof, as such, or held in trust for the College, or for the Head or any member thereof, as such, as far as the Commissioners think the modification thereof necessary or expedient for giving effect to Statutes made by them for the College :

“(9) For regulating presentations to benefices in the gift of the College :

“(10) For regulating the application of the purchase money for any advowson sold by the College :

“(11) For altering or repealing any Statute, ordinance, regulation or bye-law of the College, and substituting or adding any Statute for or to the same.”

Clause 18 reads: “The Commissioners, in Statutes made by them for a College, may from time to time make provision for the following purposes relative to the University, or any of them :

“(1) For authorising the College to commute any annual payment agreed or required to be made by it for University purposes into a capital sum to be provided by the College out of money belonging to it, and not produced by the sale of any lands or hereditaments made after the passing of this Act :

“(2) For annexing any emolument held in or connected with the College to any office in the University, or in a Hall, on such tenure as to the Commissioners seems fit, and for attaching to the emolument, in connexion

with the office, conditions of residence, study, and duty, or any of them.

“(3) For assigning a portion of the revenues or property of the College, as a contribution to the common fund or otherwise, for encouragement of instruction in the University in any art or science or other branch of learning, or for the maintenance and benefit of persons of known ability and learning, studying, or making researches in any art or science or other branch of learning in the University:

“(4) For empowering the College by Statute made and passed at a general meeting of the Governing Body of the College specially summoned for this purpose, by the votes of not less than two-thirds of the number of persons present and voting, to transfer the library of the College, or any portion thereof, to any University library:

“(5) For providing out of the revenues of the College for payments to be made, under the supervision of the University, for work done or investigations conducted in any branch of learning or inquiry connected with the studies of the University within the University:

“(6) For giving effect to Statutes made by the Commissioners for the University:

“(7) For modifying the trusts, conditions, or directions of or affecting any College endowment, foundation, or gift, concerning or relating to the University, as far as the Commissioners think the modification thereof necessary or expedient for giving effect to Statutes made by them for the University.”

Clause 21: “The Commissioners, in Statutes made by them, shall from time to time make provision—

“(1) For the form of accounts of the University, and of a College relating to funds administered either for general purposes, or in trust, or otherwise, and for the audit and publication thereof:

“(2) For the publication of accounts of receipts and expenditure of money raised under the borrowing powers of the University or of a College:

“And the Commissioners, in Statutes made by them, may from time to time, if they think fit, make provision—

“(3) For regulating the exercise of the borrowing powers of the University or of a College:

“(4) For regulating the conditions under which beneficial leases may be renewed by the University or a College.”

Clause 22: “The Commissioners, in Statutes made by them, may from time to time make provision for the complete or partial union of two or more Colleges, or of a College or Colleges and a Hall or Halls, or of two or more Halls, or of a College or Hall, with any institution in the University, or for the organization of a combined educational system in and for two or more Colleges or Halls, provided application in that behalf is made to the Commissioners on the part of each College and Hall and institution as follows :

“In the case of a College in the University of Oxford, by a resolution passed at a general meeting of the Governing Body of the College specially summoned for this purpose, by the votes of not less than two-thirds of the number of persons present and voting, and, in case of an application for complete union, with the consent in writing of the Visitor of the College.

The regulations for Cambridge are the same, except that in the case of complete union, the two-thirds majority is sufficient, without the consent of the Visitor.

Clause 44: “There shall be a Committee of Her Majesty’s Privy Council styled The Universities’ Committee of the Privy Council.

“The Universities’ Committee shall consist of the President for the time being of the Privy Council, the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being, the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain for the time being, the Chancellor of the University of Oxford for the time being, if a member of the Privy Council, the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge for the time being, if a member of the Privy Council, and such other member or two members of the Privy Council as Her Majesty from time to time thinks fit to appoint in that behalf, that other member, or one at least of those two other members, being a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.”

Clause 52: “If after the cesser of the powers of the Commissioners any doubt arises with respect to the true meaning of any Statute made by the Commissioners for

the University of Cambridge, the Council of the Senate may apply to the Chancellor of the University for the time being, and he may declare in writing the meaning of the Statute on the matter submitted to him, and his declaration shall be registered by the Registry of the University, and the meaning of the Statute as therein declared shall be deemed to be the true meaning thereof."

Clauses 53 and 54 give power to make alterations in the University and College Statutes, and Clause 55 gives the method of procedure.

The effects of the Act of 1877 may be judged of by the following extract,¹ what is said of one College being substantially true of all the rest.

"The changes introduced by the Statutes of 1882, which were the outcome of the Commissioners' labours, constituted a veritable revolution in the history of Jesus College. Some of these changes—such as the limitation of the emoluments of Fellowships, the abolition of celibacy as the condition of their tenure, the limitation of the period during which unofficial Fellowships were tenable, and the obligation imposed on the College of contributing to the common funds of the University—were features introduced into the Statutes of all Colleges alike. A few of those which concerned Jesus individually may be mentioned. To the Master and Fellows was given the right to elect to the Mastership and all Fellowships, unfettered by any reference to the Bishop of Ely. Religious tests were no longer required of a Fellow on his admission, and Clerical restrictions were abolished. The proportion of the College revenue allotted to the Open Scholarship Fund was augmented from a twentieth to a tenth part."

Clerical Fellowships thus quietly ceased to be, and the principle of religious equality was everywhere recognised except in the case of the Divinity Degrees. The tests in connexion with these degrees have since been abolished at Cambridge; Oxford has voted for their retention by a large majority; when she comes into line with Cambridge, the victory will be complete.

The Commissioners continued in power till 1881, when

¹ Gray, *Jesus College*, pp. 230-231.

the new Statutes were issued. These came into force in 1882, and constitute the Code of Laws by which the University and the Colleges are still governed. The most important provisions of the University Statutes are here summarised.

Terms.

There are to be three Terms in the year, including two hundred and twenty-seven days at least. A Term may be kept by residence during not less than three-quarters of it.¹ Three-quarters of two hundred and twenty-seven is just one hundred and seventy, so that a student need reside, and in fact does reside, only eight weeks in each Term to comply with the Statute. Terms are thus very short and crowded, and the time for teaching is much less than is required for the Tripos Examinations. Surely it is not too much to ask that there should be thirty clear weeks or two hundred and ten days instruction in the academic year. This is a very old demand on the part of reformers.

*Contributions of Colleges for University Purposes.*²

1. "Each of the Colleges shall pay to the University in every year for University purposes the sum determined by the subsequent provisions of this Statute, according to a percentage on its income.

"The income of a College shall be taken to be the gross income, external and internal, including the profits, if any, derived from the hall, kitchen, buttery, sale of commodities, and supply of service, including also such parts of the income arising from the investment of sums received from members of the College as compositions for dues payable to the University or to the Colleges, or both, as may be applied, either yearly or otherwise, to the general revenue of the College or to any purpose within the College; not including, however, the rents paid for rooms, but including instead thereof the amount at which the College buildings are from time to time assessed for municipal rates, after deducting from such gross income any sums paid thereout under the several heads next following:—

(a) Rates, taxes, and insurance on the College buildings.

¹ *Statutes of the University of Cambridge*, p. 11.

² *Ib.* pp. 37-39.

(b) Rates, taxes, insurances, tithe or other rent-charge, fee farm rents, quit rents, fines on copyhold estates, fines on renewals of leases, if and when paid by the College.

(c) The University dues paid to the University in each year by the College for such of its members as have not made compositions for dues payable to the University or the College.

(d) The cost of maintenance and repairs of the College buildings.

(e) The cost of maintenance, repairs, and improvements on the College estates incurred by the College.

(f) Necessary repairs of chancels in all cases where the same are chargeable upon the College and paid by it.

(g) Compulsory charges on the College estates or general revenue for the augmentation of benefices, and stipends of perpetual curates in parishes where the College possesses tithe rent-charge or land given in lieu of tithe.

(h) The cost of management of the College estates, including the stipends paid to College officers for the purpose.

(i) The interest on debts and loans and the repayment of principal money by instalments in all cases in which the debt has been incurred or the loan contracted for the extension of the College buildings or for the improvement of the College estates and such instalments are spread over a period of not less than twenty years.

(k) Such receipts from minerals or other sources as the College is by law required to treat as capital.

(l) Such portions of the income of trust funds as are applicable exclusively to purposes without the College.

(m) One half of the income derived from the tuition fees paid by the students.

2. "The aggregate sum to be contributed by the Colleges in every year from January 1st, 1883, to the end of the year 1884 shall be not less than £5000 nor more than £6000; in each of the years 1885, 1886, 1887, not less than £10,000 nor more than £12,000; in each of the years 1888, 1889, 1890, not less than £15,000 nor more than £18,000; in each of the years 1891, 1892, 1893, not less than £20,000 nor more than £24,000; in each of the years 1894, 1895, 1896, not less than £25,000 nor more than £30,000;

and in every subsequent year £30,000, or such larger sum being not greater than £30,500 as may be found more convenient for the purpose of calculating the rate per centum in any year. Provided that in case it appears at any time hereafter to the Financial Board hereinafter constituted that the aggregate income of the Colleges has fallen so low that the contribution required under this Chapter would be an excessive burden on the Colleges, the Chancellor may, upon the application of the Financial Board, inquire into the matter, and if he be satisfied that the fact is so, he may at his discretion direct that the amount to be levied be diminished for any period not exceeding five years by any sum not exceeding one-fifth part of the minimum amount named for each year of such period."

Section 3 directs that in 1894 and each succeeding year each College shall be entitled to deduct from its contribution £200 for each Professorial Fellowship held by a Professor of the University.

Such is the legislation which has finally carried out the intention of the Royal Commissioners of 1850 that the Colleges should contribute from their funds to University purposes. The weak spot in it lies on the surface. The cost of maintenance and repairs of both College buildings and College estates, the cost of improvements on the estates, interest on loans and instalments of principal money, are all allowed to be deducted from gross income. The Colleges have interpreted this permission generously in certain cases, and can plead in their favour that there is no definition of, or authority to, define "improvements." Moreover, if a College makes an extension and pays for it out of current income it can deduct the whole amount. These points will be recurred to in Chapters XI. and XII.

In 1877 there was an established belief that the financial resources of the Colleges would speedily show a substantial increase. The agricultural depression which followed falsified this hope, and in 1903, 1904 and 1905 the Chancellor of Cambridge University reduced the statutory contribution according to the provision quoted above.

The Common University Fund.

The College contributions are paid into the Common

University Fund, the accounts of which are kept distinct from those of the Chest or University accounts proper.

Payments out of this Fund may be made for the following purposes only :—

The stipends of Professors, Readers, and University Lecturers ;

Retiring pensions for *emeriti* Professors and Readers ;

The salaries of Demonstrators, Superintendents, and Curators ;

The erection of Museums, Laboratories, Libraries, Lecture-rooms, and other rooms for University business ;
Grants for research.

The sum paid in any year for the provision of sites and the erection of buildings and for the maintenance and furniture of buildings, including interest and sinking-fund payments, must not exceed one-third of the income of the Fund for that year.

Lord John Russell, as we have seen, was of opinion that the Colleges might fairly be called on to contribute one-fifth of their income, or 20 per cent., to University purposes. Such a levy would nearly double the present contribution at Cambridge of £30,000.

The property and income of the University, *i.e.* both the Chest and the Common University Fund, were placed by the same legislation under

The Financial Board.

Statute B, Chapter IV., reads :¹—

“1. A Financial Board shall be appointed for the care and management of the property and income of the University, consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, two members of the General Board of Studies elected by that Board, four members of the Senate elected by the Colleges in common, and four members of the Senate elected by Grace on the nomination of the Council of the Senate.

“2. For the purpose of the election of members of the Board by the Colleges in common, each College shall elect one representative. The Vice-Chancellor shall summon a meeting of the representatives of the Colleges for the election of members of the Senate to serve on the

¹ *Ib.* pp. 44, 45.

Board. Each representative shall have one vote, together with one additional vote for each complete £100 for which the College is assessed in the preceding year for University purposes.

“3. Of the members of the Board elected by the Colleges in common, not more than one shall belong to any one College.”

The Board every year prepares a statement of the sum which in its judgment ought to be levied on the Colleges, declares the respective incomes of the several Colleges which are subject to percentage, assesses the Colleges for their proportional payments, and collects the money. It has also power to require from any College explanations of the published College accounts, subject to an appeal to the Chancellor. If any question arises between the Financial Board respecting the amount of income subject to percentage, the matter is referred to the Chancellor, whose decision is final.

Special Boards of Studies.¹

The Statutes of 1882 repealed the Statute for the appointment of Boards of Studies made in 1860 and introduced the amended regulations set out below.

2. “The University shall appoint Special Boards of Studies for all important departments of study recognised in the University, to consist of the Professors hereinafter assigned to such Boards severally, together with such Readers, University Lecturers, Examiners and other persons as may be appointed from time to time by or under the authority of a Grace of the Senate.

3. “The number of such Special Boards to be appointed as soon as may be after the approval of this Statute by the Queen in Council shall be twelve, viz., for

Divinity.	Mathematics.
Law.	Physics and Chemistry.
Medicine.	Biology and Geology.
Classics.	History and Archæology.
Oriental Studies.	Moral Science.
Mediæval and Modern Languages.	Music.”

¹ *Ib.* pp. 48, 49.

To these have since been added—

Indian Civil Service	Military Studies.
Studies.	Anthropological Studies.
Economics and Politics.	Architectural Studies.
Agricultural Studies	Foreign Service Students
and Forestry.	Committee.
Geographical Studies.	

4. By this Clause, five Professors are assigned to Divinity, three to Law, four to Medicine, two to Classics, and so on.

The duties of the Boards are thus defined:¹—

“(6) It shall be the duty of every Special Board to consult together from time to time on all matters relating to the studies and examinations of the University in its department, and to prepare, whenever it appears to them desirable, and present to the Vice-Chancellor, a report to be published by him to the University.

“The Board shall also, after consultation with the Professors, Readers, and University Lecturers connected with its department, frame a scheme of lectures in every year: taking care to provide that the subjects of the said lectures be determined with regard to the general objects of every particular Professorship, and so as to distribute the several branches of learning in the department among the said Professors, Readers and University Lecturers; having regard also to the regulations and instructions which the General Board of Studies may have issued.

“(7) Every scheme so settled by any Special Board shall be submitted to the General Board of Studies; and no scheme shall be taken to be final until it has received the approval of the said General Board.”

Let us next turn to the

*General Board of Studies.*²

“9. The University shall appoint a General Board of Studies, consisting of the Vice-Chancellor, one member of each Special Board of Studies elected by that Special Board, and eight members of the Senate elected by Grace.

“12. It shall be the duty of the General Board to consult together from time to time on all matters relating to the studies and examinations of the University, in-

¹ *Ib.* pp. 50, 51.

² *Ib.* pp. 51, 52.

cluding the maintenance and improvement of existing institutions, and the establishment and maintenance of new institutions. They shall prepare, whenever it appears to them desirable, and present to the Vice-Chancellor, a report to be published by him to the University.

“13. The General Board shall issue from time to time as they think fit, regulations and instructions in respect to the subjects and character of the lectures to be delivered, the superintendence of laboratory work, the subordination when necessary of the Readers and University Lecturers to the Professors, the extent to which in any cases discourses shall be supplemented by oral or written examinations, the times and places of lecturing, the arrangements to be made for the distribution of students among the different teachers, so as to secure classes of suitable size, and to group separately the more and less advanced students, and any other matters affecting the method of instruction to be pursued, with the view of providing suitable and efficient education in all subjects of University study for all students whether more or less advanced who may require it.

“14. The General Board shall also consider the schemes for lectures in every year submitted to it by the several Special Boards, and shall approve the said schemes or remit them for further consideration with alterations and amendments, or, if necessary, frame schemes; provided that, in case the General Board of Studies and any of the Special Boards shall be unable to agree to any scheme, the question shall be referred to a meeting of the Members of the General Board and of the Special Board deliberating together, whose decision shall be final. When such schemes have been finally determined, the General Board shall present them to the Vice-Chancellor for publication.”

The composition and powers of the Financial Board, the General Board of Studies, and the Special Boards of Studies should be carefully considered, as it is through these bodies that the unification of the University, if thought desirable, must be effected.

CHAPTER X.

THE LATEST SUGGESTIONS FROM OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

The latest suggestions from Oxford are contained in Lord Curzon's book entitled "Principles and Methods of University Reform," published in 1909. Lord Curzon is Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and the book is a letter addressed in his official capacity to the University. In a preliminary letter to the Vice-Chancellor he explains that the immediate cause of his taking action was the debate in the House of Lords in July, 1907, initiated by the Bishop of Birmingham,¹ "in which he asked for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the endowment, government, administration, and teaching of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and their constituent Colleges, in order to secure the best use of their resources for the benefit of all classes of the community." Lord Curzon was strongly opposed to the appointment of any such Commission, and his Memorandum is an attempt to show how Oxford can reform itself and so escape further legislation by Parliament. He tries in fact himself to discharge the functions of a Royal Commission.

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.

Lord Curzon recognises that there was no finality in the work of previous Commissions and the legislation which followed on their labours. "We find the Reformers of 1850 engaged in the attempt to reanimate and re-inthroned the University as against the alleged encroachments of the Collegiate system, and we recognise the same note in the utterances of the present day. We find the Commissioners of that date devoting pages of print to an examination of the conditions and a suggestion of the methods by which Oxford might reopen its gates to

¹ Dr. Gore, now Bishop of Oxford.

the poor; and such is again the cry which we hear in Parliament and in the Press. One of the principal objects of the first Commissioners was the creation of a Governing Body (in the shape of a reformed Congregation) which should represent the teaching element of the University; and such is still the aspiration of those who are dissatisfied with the present composition of that body. The second Commission created the very Boards of Faculties whose organisation and work are now impugned. They definitely formulated and enforced the principle of College responsibility for a portion at any rate of the expenditure of the University, and they called into being the Common University Fund. But no finality has been reached in respect of these matters, and they are still the subject of acute, though friendly controversy. The same Commission required the auditing and publication of accounts—reforms which are admittedly susceptible of further improvement and extension. They carried the principle of open competition in respect both of Fellowships and Scholarships to an extreme pitch, with the consequence that a reaction has set in, and the administration of both forms of endowment is again in dispute. They made tentative provision for the Endowment of Research. But the strides made in advanced study have been so enormous in the last quarter of a century that what was thought liberal in 1882 is now generally regarded as halting and inadequate.”¹ But Lord Curzon still urges the old plea that Oxford is able to reform itself from within.

He classifies his suggestions under the following heads:—

“I. The Constitution of the University, as consisting of Council, Congregation, and Convocation.

II. The admission of poor men, both of the professional and working classes, which will open up the allied questions of the Collegiate and Non-Collegiate systems, the University Extension movement, and that for Working-men’s Colleges, the cost of living, and the incidence of Fees and Dues.

III. The administration of Endowments—Scholarships, Exhibitions, and Fellowships.

¹ *Principles and Methods*, pp. 16, 17.

IV. The requirement of Greek in Responsions, and the question of a University Entrance Examination, and other examinations.

V. The relations of the University and the Colleges (*a*) in their educational, and (*b*) in their financial aspect. The former branch of the subject includes the difficult questions of the Boards of Faculties and the better organisation of University teaching. The second branch will lead to the discussion of the principle and practice of College contributions to the funds of the University, and the desirability of a further extension.

VI. The Financial administration (*a*) of the University, and (*b*) of the Colleges.

VII. The executive machinery of University administration.

VIII. Facilities for advanced study and Research.

IX. Independent subjects that do not fall directly under any of the foregoing heads."¹

CHAPTER II. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY.

The Council.

Three criticisms are noticed which have been made upon the Hebdomadal Council as now constituted: (1) the Heads of Houses are over-represented; (2) the Heads of Houses ought to be chosen, not because they are Heads, but because of their personal qualifications; (3) the Council does not sufficiently represent the teaching of the University. It is suggested "that the class system should be abolished altogether, and that the entire eighteen places should be thrown open to M.A.'s of five years' standing."²

Congregation.

Congregation, as at present constituted, consists of the *ex-officio* members as set out in the Act of 1854, and of a much larger number of members qualified by residence for twenty weeks of the year within a mile and a half of Carfax—the total being somewhat over 500 persons.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 19, 20.

² *Ib.* p. 25. On May 5th, 1913, a series of resolutions was passed in Congregation dealing with the composition of the Hebdomadal Council. At Oxford such resolutions form the foundation of future legislation.

Lord Curzon gives an interesting history of this body. It was once a guild composed of all the Masters and Teachers of the University, but long before 1850 it had lost practically all its powers. "One of the main objects of the Commissioners of that date was the resuscitation of this body and the restoration of governing powers to the teaching element in Oxford. Accordingly they proposed a House of somewhat over a 100 members, to be composed of the Heads of Houses, the Proctors, the Professors and Public Lecturers, and the Senior Tutor of each College. . . . But by a strange oversight Lord John Russell's Government in 1854, in creating the new Congregation, forgot to disestablish the old, and accordingly there still exists by the side of the present House another body known as 'The Ancient House of Congregation' consisting of Heads of Houses, Doctors and Masters of two years' standing, Resident Doctors, Professors and Examiners. The functions of this body are limited to the granting of ordinary degrees, and the confirmation of the appointment of Examiners."¹

The writer's further discussion of the reform of Congregation may be omitted because on March 4th of the present year (1913), "the Statute respecting the constitution of Congregation, which provides that residence shall no longer be a qualification for membership thereof, but that in future Congregation shall consist of the teaching and administrative elements in the University and Colleges, was submitted to the House of Convocation for final approval, and was approved by a majority of 28. (Placets, 77; Non-Placets, 49.)"² Provision is made in the new Statute for safeguarding existing rights; but Oxford has this year done "what the Royal Commissioners of 1850 desired, what Lord John Russell desired, and what Mr. Gladstone desired to do just 60 years ago."³

¹ *Ib.* pp. 27, 28.

² *Times'* report of March 5.

³ *Principles*, p. 31. The text of the Statute is set out in the *Oxford University Gazette* of March 5th, 1913, pp. 551, 552 and runs as follows:—

"1. As from the first day of September next following the date of the approval of this Statute by His Majesty in Council, the Congregation of the University shall, subject to the provisions of cl. 2 below, consist of the following persons only, the said persons being members of Convocation:

Convocation.

Convocation is a more serious problem. "The present number of Convocation (which in 1852 was 3,300, and in 1868, 4,000) is over 6,700: and it consists of all M.A.'s and

- (1) The Chancellor.
- (2) The High Steward.
- (3) The Vice-Chancellor.
- (4) The Proctors.
- (5) Members of the Hebdomadal Council.
- (6) The Officers named in the Schedule annexed.
- (7) The Professors, as defined in Section 48 of the Oxford University Act, 1854.
- (8) Assistant or Deputy Professors, University Lecturers, and University Demonstrators.
- (9) The Masters of the Schools, Moderators, Public Examiners, and Examiners for the degrees in Civil Law, Medicine, and Music.
- (10) The Members of the Faculties, and the Members of the Boards of Faculties as respectively defined in Title V of the Statutes of the University, and such members of Convocation, belonging to the teaching or administrative element in the University and Colleges, as shall be designated by any Board of a Faculty as fit and proper persons to be members of Congregation on account of work done by them in the subjects with which that Faculty is conversant; a list of such persons to be drawn up by each Board at its last meeting in Trinity Term.
- (11) Members of, and Secretaries to, Delegacies, Boards, Committees, and bodies of Curators and Visitors, established by any Statute of the University.
- (12) Assistants, Librarians, and any other members of the permanent staff of any University Institution which is controlled by a Delegacy, Board, Committee, or body of Curators or Visitors, established by any Statute of the University.
- (13) Heads of Colleges, Public Halls and New Foundations, the Censor of Non-Collegiate Students, and Heads of Private Halls.
- (14) Members of the Governing Bodies of Colleges, and the principal Bursar or Treasurer of each College, if he be not a member of its Governing Body.
- (15) All persons who, on the day of the approval of this Statute by His Majesty in Council, are, and have been continuously for the ten years immediately before that day, members of any one or more of the above fourteen classes.
- (16) All such persons as shall be provided to be added by election or otherwise by any Statute of the University made with the approval of His Majesty in Council.

The Chancellor, or in his absence the Vice-Chancellor or his deputy, shall preside in the said Congregation: and the Congregation so constituted as aforesaid shall have power to frame regulations for the order of its own proceedings, but subject to any Statute which the University may make in respect thereof.

2. Every person who under the provisions of Section 16 of the Oxford University Act, 1854, would on the first day of September next

Doctors of Oxford, whether resident or non-resident, who have kept their names on the books both of the University and of any College or Hall.

"Its functions are the following:—It elects the Chancellor of the University. It elects the University representatives in Parliament. It confers Honorary and Diploma Degrees. It transacts much of the ordinary business of the University by means of Decrees. Above all it has the final voice in all University legislation, confirming or rejecting (without the right to amend) the Statutes passed by Congregation."¹

This last fact is all important. The reform of Congregation which has just been mentioned is distinctly a step in advance, but the decisions of the new body as of

following the date of the approval of this Statute by His Majesty in Council have been entitled to be a member of the Congregation of the University by reason of residence, and who shall on or before the thirty-first day of August next following the said first day of September have given notice in writing to the Vice-Chancellor that he desires to continue to be a member of the said Congregation, shall continue to be a member of the said Congregation so long as he continues to be a resident within the meaning of Section 48 of the Oxford University Act, 1854, without interruption.

3. The Vice-Chancellor shall, before the 25th day of September in each year, make and promulgate a register of the persons qualified to the best of his knowledge to be members of the Congregation of the University of Oxford. He shall also from time to time make and promulgate all such regulations as to the said register and otherwise as may be necessary for the assembling together of the Congregation, and shall appoint the time and the place at which it shall so assemble together; and no person shall be admitted to vote in or act as a member of the Congregation unless he is included in such register and is one of the persons qualified under clause 1 or clause 2 above.

SCHEDULE.

Deputy Steward.
Public Orator.
Keeper of the Archives.
Assessor of the Chancellor's Court.
Registrar of the University.
Counsel to the University.
Bodley's Librarian.
Sub-Librarians of the Bodleian Library.
Radcliffe Librarian.
Radcliffe Observer.
Assistant Registrar.
Keeper of the Antiquarium in the Ashmolean Museum.
Keeper of the Art Galleries in the Ashmolean Museum.
Keeper of the Hope Collection of Engraved Portraits.
Curator of the Pitt-Rivers Museum."

¹ *Ib.* pp. 33, 34.

the old will be subject to the approval of Convocation, and may be upset by it as before. The only advantage which the advocates of the reformed Congregation have been able to claim for it, is that it will be representative of the views of the real University—the body which actually teaches and administers, and that the outsiders will in consequence have more scruple about overriding its wishes.

Lord Curzon's criticism of Convocation cannot help being severe. "In theory the constitution of this body, which is supposed to be coextensive with the graduates of the University, is unimpeachable and democratic. But the practice differs widely from the theory. For in the first place it represents not all graduates, but only such graduates (B.A.'s) as have thought it worth while or have possessed the means to pay £12 to the University to obtain the M.A. degree, in addition to such fee as their College may require for the same step, and who further have compounded or have continued to pay to the University and the College such additional annual fee as either may exact. Out of the total number of B.A.'s it is calculated that only one-third proceed to the M.A. degree and become members of Convocation. In other words, the franchise is not primarily educational but pecuniary:¹ and the Pass-man who can afford the cost becomes a member of the Governing Body of the University, while the Honours man who cannot afford it does not. And secondly, it is a matter of common knowledge that while it contains representatives of many and diverse classes, the two classes who are most strongly represented in the ranks of Convocation are the members of the clerical and scholastic professions who find it of value to retain their connexion with the University. However this may be, it is indisputable that Convocation contains only a minority of those who have proceeded to a University degree, and that its representative aspect is sectional rather than catholic."²

¹ The reader will remember Mark Pattison's remark that the foundation of the University is property and not intelligence. See above, p. 165.

² *Ib.* pp. 34, 35.

Various proposals have been made for the reform of Convocation. Of these the first to be noticed by Lord Curzon is that advocated by Jowett and his followers—the restriction of its powers so that it could not interfere in the internal government of the University, or in educational matters. To this Lord Curzon objects that “it would be handing over the University to an oligarchy of resident teachers, to some extent detached from the outside world and independent of its criticism. . . . Further, is it not of supreme importance to maintain the connexion of Oxford with its old members, and, through them, with the nation at large?” Lord Curzon concludes: “For reasons such as these it appears to me that any attempt to sweep away Convocation as the final court in University matters would be doomed to probable failure.”¹

The second proposal is to confine the degree of M.A. to those who have either taken an Honour School or something more than the mere Pass course. This “would be a reversion to the original theory on which Convocation was based, viz. that the M.A. degree which gave entry to Convocation and a share in the government of the University, was a certificate of proficiency as a teacher.”² But there are objections to this course. Would it be wise to depreciate the lower degree and to deter the average Oxford man from taking it? Again, in the event of Convocation falling off in numbers, with a consequent loss to the revenues of the University, would there not be a temptation to recoup that loss by lowering the standard of the Honour Schools? Thirdly, there is no fundamental difference in quality or merit between the low-class Honours man and the better Pass-man.³

The third proposal is to expand Convocation by reducing the fees to a relatively nominal amount so that practically all who take the B.A. might proceed to the M.A. degree. But the pecuniary sacrifice might be very great, and Convocation might become of a too great size.

The fourth proposal is to leave Convocation as it is, and to introduce some form of suspensory veto. “Many variations of this form of limited prerogative will suggest

¹ *Ib.* p. 37.

² *Ib.* p. 38.

³ *Ib.* p. 39.

themselves. This idea of reform seems to follow the line of least resistance.”¹

CHAPTER III. THE ADMISSION OF POOR MEN.

“Of all the criticisms,” writes Lord Curzon, “passed upon modern Oxford, none can compare in the earnestness, amounting often to vehemence, with which it is urged, or in the interest which it excites, with the complaint that neither the education, the endowments, nor the social advantages of the University are sufficiently open to the man of humble means. We are told that Oxford is a place where the standard of living is high, and that of learning low; that it is the resort of idlers and loafers; that its endowments, intended for the poor, are wasted upon those who do not require them; that it is out of touch with the main system of national education, of which it ought to be the apex and crown; and that it is, in fact, the University of the leisured classes instead of the nation. Even Bishop Gore did not shrink from describing it in the House of Lords as ‘a playground for the sons of the wealthier classes,’ and as ‘not in any serious sense a place of study at all.’”²

The Commissioners of 1850 had the same problem before them, “but they deliberately declined to cater for the poor as such. . . They were more concerned in helping real ability than they were in compensating real poverty.”³ The remedial measures proposed by them—notably the argument for Open Scholarships—bore the impress of this idea. . . Their other remedial measures either failed of their object or were not attended with the desired results, in some cases because academic opinion was half-hearted or divided upon them, in others because no action was taken on those sections of the Report.”⁴

Pattison advocated the Non-Collegiate system; and Jowett, University Extension. Lord Curzon thinks the first thing necessary is “to distinguish between the various classes to whom the term ‘poor’ has been generically applied.”⁵ But before opening the University to the poor, he is anxious it should not be closed to the rich.

¹ *Ib.* p. 40.

² *Ib.* p. 42.

³ The Commissioners' view was that “what the State and the Church require is not poor men, but good and able men whether rich or poor.”

⁴ *Ib.* pp. 43, 44.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 45.

"Spurn not the nobly born," he says in the familiar words of Gilbert. Indeed, in a sense, the rich man is indispensable to the poor man, "for without his pecuniary contribution to the University there would not be that surplus, without which the University and Colleges in combination could not pay their way."¹ Besides which, Oxford in educating the so-called upper classes is fulfilling a duty every whit as national and as imperial as in stretching her resources to the uttermost for the assistance of the poor.

Lord Curzon makes a second reservation under this head. It is "that the standard of living at Oxford is primarily created by the majority of the students who frequent it," and that "no curtailment of expenditure, no redistribution of wealth that might take place, can permanently bring down the Collegiate system of living at Oxford, differing as it does *toto caelo* from the practice of Scotch or German Universities, to the level of economy that is possible in those places."² He then divides the poor into two classes, the industrial or wage-earning or artisan class, and the professional class in its many ramifications. The University must provide for both, but it will require to provide for them by different means.

Needs of the Working-Classes.

These are set out in the Report (issued in December 1908) of the Joint Committee of representatives of the University and of working-class organisations. The best of the working-classes are seeking "that training in citizenship which the study of political and economic science and of social and industrial history will give, and which Oxford, with its traditions of a wide outlook on public affairs, is more likely than any other University to bestow."³

As for the opportunities already provided by Oxford for working-class education, there may be mentioned, first,

The Non-Collegiate System.

Lord Curzon begins with a noteworthy admission. "The Non-Collegiate system, though intended for the relief of the poor, was not designed for, and has not been utilised by, the working-classes as such." But "it

¹ *Ib.* p. 46.

² *Ib.* p. 48.

³ *Ib.* p. 51.

endeavours to give every privilege which the University has it in its power to bestow, except that of life inside a College.—Further, its education is most moderate in cost. The entrance fees and dues amount to £10; the annual cost of board and lodging (in the lodgings licensed for the purpose), education, and examination is about £52: the total annual expenses at Oxford of such a student are about £70.”¹ But there are certain drawbacks to the system. The name is against it, and Lord Curzon suggests that the Non-Collegiate students should henceforth be called University students. Then the instruction provided still leaves much to be desired. But the chief impediment is the superior attractiveness of the Colleges and College life. The number of students in 1908 and 1909 showed a decline as compared with the average of the four years 1878-1881, being 166 and 172 against 202.²

The University Extension System.

This section relates to work outside the University, and as these pages deal with internal University Reform, it is here omitted, as are also the sections on

Proposals of the Working-Class Education Committee and Ruskin College.

“Other suggestions that have been made are that Colleges should build

Hostels

attached to themselves for the special accommodation of poorer men, including working-men; or that such Hostels should be created independently of the Colleges, whether of the academical type or under private supervision. . . . In both cases, and particularly in that of the independent Hostel, the difficulties of discipline and control would be considerable; and there would remain the danger, which led the Commission of 1850 to regard all these proposals with suspicion, that a distinct line of social cleavage might be created between the well-to-do man and the poor man.”³ Public Halls seem to be tending towards extinction, and there are at Oxford only three Private Halls with an undergraduate membership of not much over

¹ *Ib.* pp. 52, 53.

² *Ib.* p. 54.

³ *Ib.* pp. 61, 62.

fifty. Lord Curzon's own idea is to found at Oxford a University

Working-men's College

not confined to artisans alone, but embracing the members of all those classes who are too poor, even with financial assistance, to enter the ordinary Colleges, or to spend half the year in vacations. Such a College should have a fixed scale of cost, if possible, not more than £60 per annum. The Principal would be appointed by the University. The members of the College would be matriculated and subject to academic discipline, but would not as a rule proceed to a degree. The normal course would be one of two years, leading to a Diploma, the subjects of study being Sociology and Economics, with an admixture of History, Geography, English Literature, and Natural Science. If any student, after receiving his Diploma, wished to stay on and take a degree, he should be at liberty to do so. The College would remain in session throughout the vacation, special arrangements being made for lectures and tuition.¹

The Poor of other Classes.

From the artisan poor Lord Curzon passes to the poor of other classes, the sons of tradesmen, farmers, teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools, poor clergymen, small professional men, solicitors, land agents, doctors, etc. These classes may also be distinguished by the schools from which they come, the richer classes coming from the Public Schools, and the poorer classes, after passing through the Elementary School, coming from schools of the Municipal and County Council type. Of this latter class the number that comes to Oxford is small, but in respect of special endowments it is well provided for. "The provision made, firstly by Scholarships from Elementary or Secondary Schools, and later on by Town or County Council Scholarships, by College or City Company Exhibitions, and by private generosity, is very considerable."²

Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Schools are a class for whom a special effort ought to be made. "The

¹ *Ib.* pp. 62-66.

² *Ib.* p. 67.

University can undertake no more honourable duty than the education of those who will mould the thought of the future. More encouragement might be given to both grades by Scholarships or Exhibitions, but the real obstacle in the path of teacher-students who are proceeding to a degree is compulsory Greek in Responsions.”¹

But it may be that in spite of subsidies there are features in the Oxford system which act as a deterrent to the entry of poor students, and which it might be possible to alleviate or remove. They may relate to (*a*) the cost of living in Colleges, (*b*) the incidence of University and College Fees and Dues, (*c*) the distribution of Endowments, or (*d*) the nature and subjects of Examinations. All these Lord Curzon now proceeds to consider.

Cost of Living in Colleges.

“This is one of the oldest of complaints.” Since 1850 the outlay has been in many ways reduced by the better arrangements now made by the Colleges. Keble (where all meals are in common) makes a fixed annual charge of £85. The minimum cost at which a careful undergraduate can reside in the majority of Colleges is £100 per annum. To this, from £8 to £11 a year should be added for clubs, fees and dues, and tips to servants. These estimates exclude the cost of living in vacations, travelling, clothes, books, pocket-money, wine and tobacco. “Many proposals have been made for curtailing the expenditure thrown upon poor men by living in College. It has been suggested that two or three Colleges might be thrown into one, with the result of a considerable saving in respect of College officers and servants; or that existing Colleges should be remodelled so as to provide single rooms, instead of sets of rooms, for the average undergraduate, or that the less wealthy Colleges should shut their doors against well-to-do students. . . . More fruitful appears to me to be the suggestion that there should be a conference of College Domestic Bursars to discuss the management of College kitchens, maintenance charges in general, and the purchase of supplies.”²

¹ *Ib.* pp. 68, 69.

² *Ib.* pp. 70, 71.

Fees and Dues.

For an undergraduate taking the B.A. followed by the M.A. degree, these are as follows:—

(a) <i>University Fees.</i>		£	s.	d.
Admission Fee, paid at Matriculation...		3	10	0
Average Fees for all Examinations ...	£8 to 9	0	0	0
Admission to B.A. Degree	7	10	0
Admission to M.A. Degree	12	0	0
		<hr/>		
		£31 or £32	0	0

(b) *University Dues* (paid through Colleges).

12s. 6d. per quarter or £2 10s. 0d. per annum for a four years' course (though less for a shorter course)	10	0	0
---	-----	----	---	---

(c) *College Fees.*

Admission Fee, usually	5	0	0
Admission to B.A. Degree, average	3	14	6
Admission to M.A. Degree, average	4	9	6

(d) *Life Membership.*

(i.) University Dues: per annum	1	0	0
or Composition Charge, according to age, from	15	15	0
Recovery of right of voting in Convoca- tion, after removal of name from College books	10	0	0
(ii.) College Dues: per annum ...	14s. to	1	0	0
Composition Charge, according to age, from about	15	15	0

In these items Caution-money is not included, usually about £30, nor Tuition charges, as a rule from £22 to £25 per annum. Fees and Dues are one of the main sources of University income, the University receiving from them in 1906, £37,892; in 1907, £38,954; and in 1908, £40,678. From Admission and Degree Fees the nineteen Colleges, whose accounts are published annually, received in 1907 an income of £6,900. Lord Curzon thinks there is room for reduction in these amounts.¹

¹ *Ib.* p. 73.

CHAPTER IV. SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS, FELLOWSHIPS.

Scholarships and Exhibitions given by Colleges may be distinguished according to the subject in which they are awarded:—

	Scholarships.		Exhibitions.	
	No. given yearly.	Total No.	No. given Yearly.	Total No.
Classics ...	75	300	30	120
Mathematics ...	15½	62	5½	22
Science... ..	14	56	13	52
History... ..	14½	58	6½	26
Other Subjects	7	28	2½	10
Total	126	504	57½	230

“The most noteworthy features of the above table are (a) the predominance of the Classics, (b) the meagre place conceded to ‘other subjects.’ . . . The contents of this category are Music, Divinity, the Indian Civil Service and Research. It will thus be seen how small a portion of the outer field of learning is at present touched by the Oxford Scholarship System.”¹

It appears that many restrictions to particular districts or institutions still exist at Oxford. The number of Scholarships and Exhibitions with a local restriction is

Scholarships.		Exhibitions.	
No. given yearly.	Total No.	No. given yearly.	Total No.
30½	122	16½	66

The total sums paid out by Colleges in Scholarships and Exhibitions in 1907 was £52,890 15s. 10½d.

¹ *Ib.* p. 78.

Scholars at all the Oxford Colleges wear the Scholar's gown, and in some Colleges dine at a separate or Scholars' table in Hall. The Scholar's gown "is regarded, and in some Colleges envied, as a mark of intellectual distinction. This is a significant and most healthy symptom."¹

The total sum given in Scholarships and Exhibitions that is explicitly limited by Statute either to poor schools or poor men as ascertained by a 'Tutors' Committee was :

	<i>Annual Amount.</i>	<i>No. of Men.</i>
Poor schools	£4,400	60
Poor men	£8,800	120

"The provision of Scholarships is not meagre, and it is supplemented by grants from private funds and the Exhibition Fund—known to few but the recipient and the College authorities—which amount collectively to a very substantial additional endowment of poverty.

"Nevertheless the system is the subject of much criticism, which it behoves us to consider."² The chief complaints are four:—

(1) A large proportion of the Scholarships are held by men who do not need them.

(2) The competitive examinations for Scholarships promote an unhealthy rivalry between the Schools and lead to an undignified scramble between the Colleges for the best men.

(3) There is no University policy as to the subjects for Scholarship examinations, or as to the standard of attainment required.

(4) The great predominance of Classical Scholarships gives an undue advantage to the large Public Schools, and penalizes the newer Secondary Schools.

As for (1), Lord Curzon adduces figures to show that Bishop Gore was above the mark when he said that two out of five of the Scholars of Oxford do not need their emoluments for their education. From 10 to 6 per cent. would be a more accurate estimate. "This is not tantamount to saying that the great majority of Oxford Scholarships are held by the positively poor. . . The majority of Oxford Scholars are the sons of professional men, with incomes of varying amounts. A Scholarship

¹ *Ib.* p. 80.

² *Ib.* p. 82.

or an Exhibition is often the means of enabling the father of such a man to give a better education to his other children, and the man himself to enjoy that margin of amenity at the University which permits him to associate with his fellows without any sense of humiliation, and to reap from Oxford society some of its most valuable benefits. Such a man is not of course a pauper; but his presence at Oxford, and the influence exerted upon him, are probably not less beneficial to the community than would have been the case with the working-man or the artisan whom he is popularly supposed to have kept out.”¹

Lord Curzon thinks the real answer to the question is to be found in the much larger issue, whether Scholarships ought to be regarded as subsidies to poverty or prizes for intellectual achievement. He examines various suggestions which have been made. The first—to do away with Prize Scholarships—would lead to the rapid deterioration of the intellectual standard. Another set of reformers would revive the “close” Scholarship system. But this is obviously impracticable. A third set would divide Scholarships into (1) Honorary, to be competed for by the well-to-do, and (2) eleemosynary, to be competed for or enjoyed by the poor. Lord Curzon rejects all these plans. His conclusion is that “in any serious attempt to vary the emoluments of Oxford Scholarships, obstacles of law as well as moral scruples have to be encountered, co-operation between a large number of Colleges is almost essential to ensure success, and without an agreement between Oxford and Cambridge no very considerable or far-reaching change can be hoped for.”²

The second and third charges “contain much truth, although they are only part of the wider arraignment that may be directed against the system of competitive examinations at large.” A definite suggestion, however, has been made for obviating the least desirable features of the annual competition. “It is that the whole of the Scholarships should be pooled, and should be awarded by examinations held two or three times a year by the School Examination Delegacy, or by a specially appointed

¹ *Ib.* pp. 83, 84.

² *Ib.* p. 87.

University Board. The scholars would be distributed among the various Colleges, both Colleges and candidates being allowed some liberty of choice—an extension, in fact, of the system already adopted in the combined College Examinations.”¹ Lord Curzon rejects this solution also. In his view “the weak point in the present system is the fact that owing to the great number of Scholarships that are given for Classics (a system that has its roots in the close connexion between the older Universities and the chief Public Schools) the prizes are in excess of the candidates worthy to win them. . . . When we see that places in the Third and even the Fourth Class in Honour Moderations are taken by wearers of the Scholar’s gown, the mischief must lie deeper than in the manner or method of examination alone. My own solution of the Scholarship difficulty is . . . a redistribution of our Scholarships and Exhibitions on a broad and systematic scale.”²

Lord Curzon’s redistribution scheme is as follows:—

“A list will perhaps best indicate the subjects in which Scholarships and Exhibitions would be eagerly welcomed, if they were forthcoming.

A. For the encouragement of the Poor.

(i.) The Non-Collegiate system.

(ii.) Ruskin College.

(iii.) A new Working-men’s College.

(iv.) At ordinary Colleges.

(v.) Elementary and Secondary School Teachers.

B. For English Literature.

C. For Modern Languages.

D. For Post-Graduate Study or Research.

E. For subjects (other than Classics) included in any of the University courses.

F. For University Scholarships, should the previously discussed experiment be thought desirable and a certain number of College Scholarships be placed at the disposal of the University for distribution between the Colleges after a University Examination.”³

Possible methods of carrying out this scheme are then examined.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 88, 89.

² *Ib.* pp. 90, 91.

³ *Ib.* pp. 91, 92.

Fellowships.

Lord Curzon gives a brief history of Fellowships, noting that "Prize Fellowships were earnestly advocated by Jowett and others, on the grounds that they would provide (a) a reward of ability, (b) an opportunity for independent study, (c) a stepping-stone to professional careers, and (d) a link between the residents of Oxford and the outside world."¹ The Commissioners of 1877-1882 created three classes of Fellows at Oxford, viz.:—

I. Professorial Fellows, *i.e.* Fellowships attached to University Professorships;

II. Official or Tutorial Fellows, *i.e.* Fellowships held by the Educational Staff of the College;

III. Ordinary, often popularly called Prize Fellows.

The Prize Fellow was not to have more than a certain income (generally £500 a year); he was (after a year of probation) under no obligation to reside, or to serve his College in any capacity; he received £200 a year for seven years. These Fellowships are awarded after a special Fellowship examination.

Financial difficulties have prevented the scheme of the Commissioners from being carried into full execution. At the present time there are 315 Fellows of Oxford Colleges (including the Professor-Fellows and the Canons of Christ Church) of whom a little more than 220, or 70 per cent., are on the Collegiate Staff, or are engaged in University or College work. A certain number of Fellows on the Old Foundation (*i.e.* before 1877, and even before 1850) still survive. The total amount that appeared in the College Accounts for 1907 as having been paid to Fellows was £61,550 19s. 10d. This did not include the Fellowships of the Professor-Fellows or a considerable portion of the £20,352 13s. 2d. paid to the Professors, nor the sums paid under independent trusts to the Fellows of Hertford, Balliol, and Oriel. The modern tendency of feeling is against Prize Fellowships. There is "an increasing desire that the endowments of Oxford shall be devoted to the direct and immediate service of the University whether inside or outside it; that neither intellectual merit nor political distinction shall create

¹ *Ib.* p. 94.

any claim to participation in them unless it accepts this obligation.”¹ Lord Curzon believes in Prize Fellowships so far as they form a link between Oxford and the outside world. “For myself,” he adds, “I would like to see, as in the case of Scholarships, an examination of the entire system of Fellowships and their allocation on more scientific and harmonious lines. At present a College may assign one of its Ordinary Fellowships to any purpose agreeable to itself, provided that it is in conformity with the Statutes; and it is naturally guided in doing so, firstly by the interests or requirements of the College, and only secondarily by those of the University. Without infringing this principle, good might result from more consultation and from an attempt, renewed from time to time, to map out the entire area of University and College requirements, and to distribute this imposing income in the manner best calculated to promote the advancement of learning. One College might promise a Fellowship for one subject, another for another; there would be method instead of accident, and co-operation in place of caprice. In this way large gaps in University teaching might by degrees be filled. Fellowships might be provided for University Extension, or for Tutorial work among Non-Collegiate students and in Working-Men’s Colleges and Halls; and a definite scheme might be constructed of Research Fellowships, spread over the whole field of advanced studies.”²

Lord Curzon then passes on to

CHAPTER V. UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS.

He would do away with compulsory Greek in Responsions, the Oxford Previous Examination, or Little-go. As for Responsions, it is “half an Entrance Examination and half not, and is as unsuitable, in its methods and subjects, for the former object as it is ill-adapted for a University Preliminary Examination.”³ There is no University Entrance Examination. “A test for admission to its privileges is a matter from which the University deliberately dissociates itself. . . . It is the Colleges who have been conceded or have acquired the power of deciding who shall or shall not be members of the

¹ *Ib.* p. 97.

² *Ib.* pp. 99, 100.

³ *Ib.* p. 107.

University. . . Oxford and Cambridge are, I believe, the only Universities in the world in which this system prevails. It has grown up because of the circumstances in which the Colleges themselves grew up, and because throughout their joint history there has never been any clear division between the functions of the University and those of the Colleges, the latter being corporate bodies with their own laws and regulations, separate from, and in most respects independent of the University. It is much as though Eton and Harrow were to admit boys to membership, not upon an Entrance Examination conducted by themselves, but upon whatever exam. each of the house-masters might choose to enforce for his individual house. The result is, firstly, that the University has no voice in determining the conditions of its own membership; secondly, that there is a wide variety of standard created by the Colleges. A man who is rejected at one College may even pass on and obtain admission at another, the scale of requirement descending in proportion to the character and reputation of the College. So startling an anomaly could not escape the notice of the first Commission, and one of the many wise recommendations made by them, but unhappily disregarded, was the institution of a University Matriculation Examination."¹ The machinery for holding this examination now exists (at any rate in outline) whereas fifty years ago it would have had to be created. "I allude of course to the system of examinations and certificates as conducted by the Local Examination Delegacy, and the Delegacy for the Inspection and Examination of Schools, which is the Oxford half of the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Examination Board."² Lord Curzon favours "a universal and elastic system of School-leaving examinations, conducted by the Universities in consultation with the Government and the masters of Secondary Schools."³

The Pass-Man and Pass-Schools.

As for the much-abused Pass-man, Lord Curzon holds that "it is part of the function of Oxford to educate him; and that, if it is to continue to deserve the name of a University, it has few more important duties to perform

¹ *Ib.* pp. 108, 109.

² *Ib.* p. 111.

³ *Ib.* p. 112.

than to give a good general education to the man of birth and means ('Spurn not the nobly born,' we are told once more). . . It is not necessary, accordingly, to take up the position—though it is true—that without the Pass-man, Oxford would not be able to pay its way. . . It is worthy of consideration whether a wider range of alternatives, guiding the Pass-man into practical courses and offering a greater stimulus to his intelligence, might not be discovered.”¹

A Business Education.

“There is one subject in which I should like to see the University interest itself, namely, the creation of special facilities for the education of business men. . . I should like to see a substantial two years' course with instruction in Modern History, Commercial Geography, Political Economy, the methods of Accounting, and the principles of Exchange, culminating in a Diploma, specially constructed for the requirements of a business career.”²

CHAPTER VI. RELATIONS OF THE COLLEGES AND THE UNIVERSITY— ORGANISATION OF TEACHING.

In Chapter VI., which deals with the above topics, Lord Curzon comes to the heart of his subject. The chief work done at Oxford and Cambridge is that of teaching. It is divided between the University and the Colleges, and that not according to a carefully considered system, but haphazard, as things have chanced to shape themselves. Again, teaching cannot be given without being paid for. Thus a double set of problems is raised of (1) the educational relations, and (2) the financial relations between the Universities and the Colleges. Lord Curzon therefore is entirely in the right when he describes the subject of this chapter as “the most difficult of academic problems, viz. the reconciliation of the Colleges with the University, and of the Tutorial with the Professorial system.” “First called attention to by the writings of Sir William Hamilton in 1831, it loomed large before the Commissioners of 1850. Page after page of their report testifies to their anxiety concerning the

¹ *Ib.* pp. 117, 118.

² *Ib.* p. 118.

readjustment of these relations. Such phrases as 'the Colleges have absorbed the University and drawn to themselves its functions,' 'the Tutors have become the sole authorised teachers of the University,' 'the monopoly of the Colleges,' and 'the University must be restored to its proper superiority,' occur with impressive frequency, and were employed by the Commission to justify the majority of their reforms—for instance, the reorganization and re-endowment of the Professoriate, the liberation of Fellowships and Scholarships, and the creation of the Unattached Students. The duty of the Colleges to the University was carried a step further in the financial measures ordered by the Commission of 1877, and in the creation of the Common University Fund; while the better organisation of studies and control of examinations under the eye of the Professors was believed to be provided for by the Boards of Faculties and Boards of Studies that were simultaneously called into being.

"Since the reforms of 1882 there has on the whole been a steady, though often unrecognised, progress in the direction of strengthening the University. The increase in the number of Professors and other University Teachers has been especially striking; their number, as given in the Calendar for 1908, being 110. Of these, 9 represent Theology, 7 Law, 31 Medicine, Natural Science, and Mathematics, and 63 Arts and Letters. Their stipends, paid by the University and the Colleges (apart from fees) amount to £40,000 per annum. They divide the instruction of the University with the College Tutors and Lecturers, of whom there are about 150, and who are remunerated partly by College Fellowships, partly by contributions from the College Tuition Funds. The presence of so many Professors on the Governing Bodies of the Colleges also gives the University a direct voice, which formerly did not exist, in Collegiate administration and instruction.

"Nevertheless the complaint that the Colleges still dominate the Universities has been actively revived, and is in the forefront of every call for University reform. This is due partly to the great improvements that have taken place in the Tutorial system, enhancing its utility and influence and practically extinguishing the once

flourishing system of private Tutors and Coaches; partly to the Inter-Collegiate system of Lectures that has enabled the Colleges to concentrate their instruction and sweep large numbers of men into their Lecture-rooms; and partly to the rapid development of knowledge and subdivision of its branches, for dealing with which the Colleges possess an unrivalled organisation ready to hand. Accordingly it is once again represented that the University is not master in its own house, and does not adequately control its own teaching. The commonest form in which the complaint arises is as follows. A College appoints A or B to be a Lecturer because he is a Fellow, or appoints him a Lecturer and then gives him a Fellowship. Straightway he becomes a University Lecturer, without being required to furnish any proof of his qualifications; and he continues to be one, the Boards of Faculties, who are supposed to control the Lecture-list when submitted to them, failing to exercise any real supervision. This, it is pointed out, is unsatisfactory to all parties; to the University because its staff has been increased without its knowledge or consent; to the College because it is furnishing from its own staff an officer, who, though paid exclusively by itself, is doing outside work; to the Tutor because he receives no return for his service to the University; and to the system of instruction at large because too many lecturers are apt to be appointed, too many of them lecture on the same subject, and (it is said) too many lecture who cannot lecture at all.”¹ Lord Curzon also points out that “In all classes there is manifest the same ungrudging admission of the right of the University as a great Teaching Society to control the instruction which it offers”; and adds: “It is not in the smaller and newer Faculties, but in the older branches of study, and notably in *Literae Humaniores*, that the want of co-ordination and the lack of control are most urgently felt.”²

Boards of Faculties.

By the Statutes of 1882, Tit. V., a Faculty was thus defined: “In and for the purpose of this Statute,

¹ *Ib.* pp. 121, 122.

² *Ib.* pp. 123, 124.

the word 'Faculty' shall denote any branch or aggregate of branches of the studies pursued in the University, which for the time being shall be represented by a separate Board." There are at Oxford seven Faculties and seven Boards of Faculties, and these Boards control the studies they represent so far as they are controlled. "By the same Statute, six Boards of Studies were constituted for the supervision of certain stated examinations, these being composed of representatives drawn from the Boards of Faculties. These bodies in combination are thus invested by law with the control of all the examinations of the University, and with the supervision of its entire scheme of lectures, University and College."¹

The criticisms passed on these Boards are (1) that they are not representative of University teaching; (2) that they pay excessive regard to examinations, and are in reality Examination Boards rather than Faculties representing subjects; (3) that they exercise no real control over the lectures, merely registering where they ought to revise; (4) they are impotent because the Professors are liable to be outvoted by the College Tutors, and thus the latter really control the University curriculum.

Proposed Reforms.

Lord Curzon here distinguishes three schools of reformers. "First are those who are quite willing that the Boards should be reconstituted, and if necessary increased, but who hold that they are already empowered to establish the requisite control over University teaching."² "Next are those who hold that there should be created a clear distinction between the two classes of teachers: (1) University lecturers, and (2) College teachers; that the former should be a recognised status conferred by the University alone, freely, but on a definite system; and that the Colleges, in filling up their Fellowships and Tutorships, should enter into consultation with the University as to the manner of man to be appointed, if he is to merit admission to the University list. . . This would be, in fact, to give the University

¹ *Ib.* p. 126.

² *Ib.* p. 129.

a veto on College appointments. . . The third and last scheme proposes that a Central Board or Council of Faculties should absorb the Common University Fund, and that it should further be charged with the appointment and payment of all University Lecturers, and of all Professors and Readers where not otherwise provided for, the regulation of all matters relating to the studies and examinations of the University, and the admission of new or the subdivision of old Faculties.”¹

Lord Curzon concludes: “It should not be out of the power of Council by a careful comparison of the good points of the many plans in existence, to evolve some method of placing the relations of the University and the Colleges on a more stable footing. Perhaps the Common University Fund might be rendered more representative of the Faculties if its operations and powers were safeguarded in the manner which will be hereafter proposed. There would still remain the question of the reorganisation of the University studies as a whole, and of the examinations by which they are tested.”² But this last is a subject raising such large and complicated issues that Lord Curzon excuses himself from entering on it.

College Statutes.

The University of Oxford has appointed a Standing Committee of the Council to examine all College Statutes which are brought before the Privy Council with a view to protecting the interests of the University. “This is a step in advance, but it remains to be seen whether the University has adopted sufficient guarantees to ensure that its own interests are in no way impaired.”³

Chapter VII., on the Revenue, Expenditure and Financial Administration of the University, is dealt with later on in Chapter XI. of this book.

CHAPTER VIII.—EXECUTIVE MACHINERY OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT.

“The organisation of the University suffers from many defects which impair its efficiency, and breed confusion and delay. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance of this lack of system is presented by the Executive

¹ *Ib.* pp. 129-136.

² *Ib.* pp. 138, 139.

³ *Ib.* p. 134.

Machinery of the University. It might be expected that it would at least possess, in the staff of officials who manage its business, and in the office where their records are kept and their business is done, an adequate and efficient machinery. Such is very far from being the case.”¹

The Vice-Chancellor.

“In olden days the M.A.’s elected their own Vice-Chancellor; but in 1636 this power was transferred to the Chancellor, who now annually nominates the Vice-Chancellor as his deputy from among the Heads of Houses in the order of their election as Head, usually for four successive years. . .

“The duties of this officer are overwhelming in their number and complexity. He presides over Council, the two Congregations, and Convocation. . . He is a member of every Board, Delegacy and Committee in the University. . . These facts have prompted two suggestions. One is that the Chancellor should be empowered to appoint as his deputy some independent and leisured person, who should devote his entire time and abilities to University work. . . The other suggestion is that the Chancellor should choose from a list submitted to him by the Hebdomadal Council. . . There does not appear to be sufficient reason for discussing any revolutionary change. The real reform lies not in altering the choice of the man so much as in reducing and systematising his work.”²

The University Staff.

This consists of a Registrar, an Assistant Registrar, and a Secretary to the Curators of the Chest. Lord Curzon advises the institution of a University Office with a University Secretariat or Staff. “Whether such a provision should be made by a development of the existing Registrar’s Office, or by entirely new arrangements, is a matter which the Council will be well qualified to decide.” A University Architect and a Clerk of the Works would also be required.³

Finally Lord Curzon says: “I may be permitted to remark that in the multiplicity of Boards and Delegacies,

¹ *Ib.* p. 172.

² *Ib.* pp. 172-175.

³ *Ib.* pp. 175-177.

by which the University endeavours to cope with its tremendous task, lies an inevitable source of much delay and dissipation of energy, which a more centralised and scientific organisation might prevent; . . . even if the University cannot reduce the number of these agencies, at least it should insist that its executive committee, the Hebdomadal Council, shall bring these bodies into closer relation with itself, and shall exercise a more harmonising, and therefore a more effective, control over their operations.”¹

CHAPTER IX. ENCOURAGEMENT OF RESEARCH.

The encouragement of Research finds no place in the recommendations of the Commission of 1850. Matthew Arnold was the pioneer of the movement in its favour. He was followed by Mark Pattison and Jowett, and the Common University Fund of the 1877-82 Commission was the result, being designed to encourage teaching and study outside the ordinary curriculum, and having its objects specifically defined as Instruction and Research.

Lord Curzon argues that the main function of Oxford must be to teach, and that it is impossible for it to emulate either a University like the Johns Hopkins at Baltimore, which exists for post-graduate study only; or like Harvard, which has more than 350 post-graduate students in Arts. Still it is a duty to provide for it.

Facilities for Advanced Study.

The facilities for Advanced Study are then enumerated—the Fellowships and Scholarships, the Prizes, the Diplomas, the B.C.L., the new Degrees of B.Litt. and B.Sc., the Libraries and Seminars, the Laboratories, and the publications of the Clarendon Press. All these things point to a great advance. “At the same time it is only too true that the amount of original work as yet turned out from Oxford is inconsiderable. . . .

A University Policy of Research.

In the first place I am not aware that the question of its attitude toward Research has ever been considered by the University as a whole, *i.e.* by the University and Colleges in combination. Might it not be a

¹ *Ib.* p. 178.

good thing if the resources of the two partners that may be available for the purpose were compared and co-ordinated, and if a plan were to be worked out by which each member of the federation should contribute, according to its means and inclination, to the common end? It might be a function of the Central Board of Finance to take early counsel with the University and Colleges in this matter; or Council itself might undertake the labour or delegate it to one of its Committees."¹

CHAPTER X. INDEPENDENT SUBJECTS.

Lord Curzon here turns to a number of independent subjects—Election to Professorships, where he suggests various improvements; a Pension Fund for the Professoriate; Degrees for Women; the Conferment of Honorary Degrees; a three-years' Honour Course; a longer Academical year; and the Indian Institute.

CHAPTER XI. SUMMARY.

Finally, the writer summarises his suggestions, pointing out that "a fourfold duty lies on the University: (1) to provide the best teaching over the entire field of knowledge of which its own resources and the progress of science may admit; (2) to offer this teaching to the widest range of students; (3) to mould and shape them not merely by the training of intellect but by the discipline of spirit; and (4) to extend by original inquiry the frontiers of learning."²

Lord Curzon has laid his finger on the weak spots in the Oxford system, but he indicates rather the direction which reforms must take, than the ultimate reforms themselves. At the same time he is to be congratulated on the success which certain of his suggestions have already met with.

We now come to the latest suggestions from Cambridge. Early in the Easter Term of 1909, a memorial was received by the Council of the Senate from certain resident members of the University requesting that various questions, connected with the constitution and the government of the University, and with the relations of the Colleges to the University and to one another, should

¹ *Ib.* p. 186.

² *Ib.* p. 210.

be taken into consideration.¹ Reports were annexed to the memorial. These Reports were the outcome of a series of unofficial meetings of members of the Senate; the first of which was held on February 10th, 1908, and the last on March 10th, 1909. The above Committee on the Constitution and Government of the University limited their suggestions in the first instance to two questions only: (1) the reconstitution of the Electoral Roll; and (2) the functions of the Senate and the Electoral Roll as reconstituted.

"The object which they have had in view has been to suggest a scheme which would give to the body of residents engaged in teaching, research, and administration, a larger share than it at present possesses in the legislative action of the University. The effect of the scheme suggested would be to establish two Houses, one a body of residents, and the other the Senate as at present constituted."² In other words, the design was to put more power into the hands of those who do the actual work of the University and to leave less power in the hands of the absentees, a course which has now been followed at Oxford. The documents submitted to the Council were: (1) a suggested reconstitution of the Electoral Roll; (2) suggested alterations in the functions of the Senate and of the Electoral Roll as reconstituted, with two Appendices; (3) a report on the constitution of the Senate, with a view of effecting the following changes:—(a) to diminish as far as practicable the charge (£12) at present made for the M.A. or equivalent degree, (b) to increase the proportion of graduates who are members of the Senate, and (c) to avoid financial loss to the University; (4) a memorandum by Mr. H. McLeod Innes on the financial aspect of the degree question; (5) a Report on the relation of the Colleges to the University and to one another, divided under the following heads: (A) teaching for Honours-Examinations, (B) contributions of the Colleges to the University, and (C) the cost of living at Cambridge.

The Council decided not to nominate a special Syndicate or Syndicates to deal with the matters in

¹ *University Reporter*, 1910, p. 675.

² *Report*, p. 2.

question, but in the first instance to undertake the duty themselves, and to deal with the constitution and government of the University to begin with, leaving the second question over till a later date. The Council's report was published on February 28, 1910; it was discussed in April and May, and an amended report was published on June 6, 1910. Its recommendations were voted on in the October term and were rejected. In consequence of this adverse decision the question of the relations of the Colleges to the University and to one another has never been officially considered. There was a subsequent recommendation to alter the B.A. and M.A. degree fees, but this also was rejected, so that this attempt to reform Cambridge from within failed completely. No change of any kind was made. The various suggestions of the unofficial Committee are dealt with more fully in the last chapter, so that this brief notice must not be taken as indicating their real importance.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

It seems most convenient to deal with the question of University finance in a separate chapter. The Commissioners of 1850 nominally dealt with it, but the information they were able to obtain was fragmentary and incomplete, especially as regards Oxford. Mark Pattison writes¹: "The Report of the Commission of 1852 was defective on the point of finance. Their statement (*Report*, pp. 125-127) of the University income and expenditure is not accurate, and on the property and revenue of the Colleges they have few data. . . . When, in 1854, Parliament undertook to transfer a portion of the College revenues, it was not only robbing, but robbing in the dark."

The Royal Commission of 1872 was appointed, as has been seen, to inquire into the revenues and property of the two Universities. It was thus strictly supplementary to the inquiry of 1850. Mr. Gladstone, in Pattisonian phrase, was determined, if he robbed at all, to rob in the daylight. The Report presented in 1874 still remains the chief source of information on the matters of which it treats.

The following is the account therein given of the origin of University and College property²:—

"The properties of the Universities have for the most part arisen from gifts entrusted to them for specific purposes.

"The Colleges which were first established in the 13th century received from their founders an endowment of

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 51, 52.

² *Report*, pp. 25, 26.

manors, lands, and houses, generally to an extent that was barely adequate to provide the payments and expenses of maintenance which were directed to be allowed by the Statutes. Subsequently were added impropriations of rectories, with their tithe property, in some cases for a period of years to meet the first expenses of the College fabric, in others as a permanent annexation to the foundation. The larger Colleges in both Universities were not established until the 14th and 15th centuries, when the suppression of the alien Priories offered the means of devoting much ecclesiastical property to academical purposes. It was not an uncommon method of founding a College that a founder should, with the sanction of the Crown and the authority of the Church, acquire both the site and the estates of some religious house in Oxford or Cambridge which had perhaps fallen into disrepute or decay, obtain its formal dissolution, and establish his own College in its stead. The dissolution of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. became the occasion for diverting a still larger amount of ecclesiastical and other property, more particularly of impropriate tithes, to Collegiate uses. In the times subsequent to the Reformation considerable accretions of endowment have been made to Colleges which were already founded with the view of promoting the education of future ministers of the Church, of furnishing educational encouragement for particular schools, districts, or families, of providing a more liberal maintenance for the members of the society, or generally of expressing the goodwill and affectionate regard of the benefactor for the particular House of which, perhaps, he had himself been a member, it may be a recipient of its bounty.

“There are not wanting examples of additions to the several foundations having been occasioned in the earliest times by a desire to encourage special studies and professional pursuits; but when it was the object of the founder to introduce or to promote some new branch of learning or science, it was the more usual practice for him to confide his gift to the care of the University at large, rather than of an individual College.”

The Commissioners continue :—

“From these various sources there has grown up a large mass of property which for the purposes of our inquiry we have arranged under six heads, viz.:—(1) Lands; (2) House Property; (3) Tithe Rent Charges; (4) Other Rent Charges, such as fee farm rents and fixed charges; (5) Stocks, Shares and other Securities of a similar kind; and (6) Other Properties, such as fines and other profits from copyholds of inheritance, minerals, timber, etc.”

The Commissioners considered that it would be best to conduct their inquiry by means of written rather than of oral evidence. Forms were therefore sent out arranged under sixteen heads. In the Returns and Abstracts prepared from them, properties and income held and enjoyed for corporate use were distinguished by the letter A, and those held subject to special trusts by the letter B. The Universities, the Colleges, and all their officers, with a few exceptions, supplied the information asked for. But, add the Commissioners:—“We regret to say that Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, failed to give the required information. The Fellows of the College indeed expressed their willingness that the information should be given, but as the Master discharges the duties of Bursar, and has the College account-books in his custody, the Fellows had not the means which would enable them to make the necessary returns.”¹

As for Trusts, the Commissioners report:—“Our attention has been specially called to the properties held in trust by the University and the Colleges. There are only a very few cases in which the beneficial interest of the trust property is wholly external to the University or College which holds the trust. In almost all cases the trustee-corporation has a beneficial interest either contingent or partial in the trust estate. The objects of the trusts are almost universally one or other of the following:—The maintenance of or aid towards a Professorship, Teachership, or Lectureship, or some institution for the encouragement of Literature, Science, or Art; Scholarships or Exhibitions in the Universities or some College, those attached to Colleges being

¹ *Ib.* p. 24.

frequently accompanied with a condition of preference for some candidates from some school or district, with a power to the College to elect by open competition in case no properly qualified candidate presents himself; prizes; the purchase of ecclesiastical benefices, and the improvement of the benefices which are in the gift of the College. Many benefactions have been made in times past for the common benefit of all or some members of the foundation of a College. Many special foundations for Fellowships and Scholarships have also been established in all respects similar to the Fellows and Scholars on the original foundation, with this important exception, viz., that the Fellows were not members of the Corporation, and generally had no voice in the management of the College. To remedy this disability, and to give to all common interests, the Commissioners appointed under the University Reform Acts of 1854 and 1856, in the exercise of the powers given to them, consolidated these bye-foundations with the original foundations of the College, and fused the property and income. The result of this consolidation was a very large reduction in the number of the Trust Funds of the Colleges. In some instances, however, Trust Funds of a mixed character could not be treated in this manner; and they still remain subject to separate and distinct administration and account.

“It may be observed that though these funds are not divisible among the Head and Fellows of a College, yet in many cases they indirectly increase the divisible revenue, inasmuch as they bear charges for chapel, library, repairs and the like, which would otherwise fall on the general funds of the College.”¹

After these preliminary remarks, the Commissioners proceed to consider,—

- I. The Property of the Universities and Colleges on 1st January, 1872.
- II. The Income of the Universities and Colleges in the year 1871.
- III. The Expenditure of the Universities and Colleges in the year 1871.

¹ *Report*, pp. 24, 25.

I. PROPERTY OF THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
ON 1st JANUARY, 1872.

To take the six heads given above.

(1) LANDS.

The landed estates comprise 319,718 acres distributed throughout the whole of England and Wales, but situated in larger quantities in the southern than in the northern counties. Of these

7,683 acres belong to the University of Oxford.

2,445 " " " " " " Cambridge.

184,764 " " " " " " Colleges and Halls of Oxford.

124,826 " " " " " " of Cambridge.

Part of these lands is let on what are called beneficial leases, which form of tenure the Commissioners thus explain:—

"Its distinctive feature is this, that only a small part, in most cases only a nominal part of the annual value of the property leased is represented in the form of yearly rent, the remainder being paid for by the lessee in the way of fine, foregift, or premium, and that at fixed periods *in anticipation* of the term in respect of which this peculiar payment is made. . . In other words, the leases are at the times indicated restored to the full term of lives or years for which they were originally granted in consideration of a payment (called a fine) which may be regarded as the purchase-money of a term in reversion commencing at the expiration of the 14 or 26 years still remaining in the lease. The result of this system is that the yearly income of the College is uncertain and precarious, and that at all times a large part of the fee-simple value of the estate under beneficial lease is the property of the lessee, and must virtually be bought back before the College can enjoy the full annual value."¹ This form of leasing is strongly condemned both for lands and houses. The Act of 1877, section 21 (4) enacts that the Commissioners appointed by the Act may "make provision for regulating the conditions under which beneficial leases may be renewed by the University or a College." But the Commissioners, so far as I can find, never made any Statute to this effect.

¹ *Ib.* p. 26.

(2) HOUSE PROPERTY.

Annual Income (less fixed charges)¹:—

				£	s.	d.
University of Oxford	1,162	14	2
University of Cambridge	156	10	0
Colleges of Oxford	34,152	15	8
Colleges of Cambridge	54,286	1	1

(3) TITHE RENT-CHARGES.

The Universities and Colleges held Tithe Rent-charges to the following amounts²:—

				£	s.	d.
University of Oxford	1,244	10	10
University of Cambridge	1,741	0	9
Colleges and Halls of Oxford	83,238	12	5
Colleges of Cambridge	63,679	9	5

(4) OTHER RENT-CHARGES.

These are generally small.

(5) STOCKS AND SHARES.

The Universities and Colleges hold Stocks and Shares, the annual income of which is:—

				£	s.	d.
University of Oxford	13,068	16	10
University of Cambridge	7,687	5	8
Colleges and Halls of Oxford	26,426	11	6
Colleges of Cambridge	19,314	5	7

(6) OTHER PROPERTIES.

The chief item is copyholds of inheritance, but it is not a large one. The number of benefices in the gift of the Universities and Colleges, and the net annual income thereof, is returned or estimated as follows:—

			Number.	Annual net Income.
				£ s. d.
University of Oxford	5	1,036	7 0
University of Cambridge	1	394	0 0
Colleges and Halls of Oxford ...	439	187,659	4	3
Colleges of Cambridge ...	311	135,016	17	11

II. INCOME OF THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE YEAR 1871.

The total income of the Universities and Colleges in 1871 was £754,405 5s. 1½d. Of this sum £665,601 10s. 2½d.

¹ See p. 29 (Summary).² *Ib.* p. 28.

was for (A) corporate use, and £88,803 14s. 11d. was (B) subject to conditions of trust, being thus divided¹:—

		A			B		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
University of Oxford	32,151	1	0	15,437	19	3
University of Cambridge	23,642	19	5	10,407	17	10
Colleges and Halls of Oxford	330,836	16	1	35,417	0	2
Colleges of Cambridge	278,970	13	8½	27,540	17	8

The revenues arise from two different sources: (1) the properties already detailed; and (2) the room rents, and dues and fees paid by the members of the University or the Colleges. The former the Commissioners call External Income, and the latter Internal Income.

The following is the conspectus of the whole External Income after deducting fixed payments such as Land Tax and Tithe Rent-charge:—

	Lands.			Houses.			Tithe rent-charges.			Other rent-charges.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
University of Oxford	12,083	0	4	1,162	14	2	490	19	7	872	6	9
University of Cambridge	3,148	19	8	156	10	0	1,784	14	5	333	16	6
Colleges & Halls of Oxford	170,990	11	7½	26,833	6	3	34,152	15	8	4,092	14	10
Colleges of Cambridge	132,671	0	6	25,993	8	2	54,286	1	1	3,943	2	2
	£318,893	12	1½	54,145	18	7	90,714	10	9	9,242	0	3

Stocks, Shares, &c.	Other Properties.			Special endowment of Head.	Loans.			Total.
	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.	
12,939 6 9	1,494	16	2	—				29,043 3 9
7,648 9 0	844	19	2	—				13,917 8 9
24,242 7 10½	13,574	14	3	6,289 0 6	27,194	6	2	307,369 17 2
16,508 7 5	20,365	8	8½	1,764 9 10				264,256 17 10½
£61,338 11 0½	36,279	18	3½	8,053 10 4	27,194	6	2	614,587 7 6½

The Internal Income of the Universities arises almost wholly from taxation.

“At Oxford every member of the University pays £1 annually to the University Chest. Those who have been

¹ *Ib.* p. 29.

admitted to the degree of M.A., B.C.L., or B.M., can compound for these dues by a single payment. These sums are invested, and amounted on July 15th, 1871, to £14,900 Consols. Fees are also charged at Matriculation, at all Examinations, and on Graduation. The Internal Income thus raised in the year ended July 15th, 1878, amounted to £18,066 8s. 6d.

At Cambridge every member of the University pays annually a capitation charge of 17s.¹ There is no University compounding, but the Colleges accept a composition both to themselves and to the University.

The Internal Income of the Colleges arises from rents of rooms occupied by members of the College; from fees paid on entrance and graduation; from dues paid by all members whether resident or non-resident; from profits of the establishment, chiefly in its buttery and kitchen departments; and from small casual payments. The rate at which fees and dues are levied, and the time over which they are payable, varies in every College, and in some Colleges varies with the different classes of students.

In the matter of internal economy, and consequently in that of Internal Income, there is no uniformity of practice, and it cannot be said with certainty in all cases whether profit, properly so called, accrues to a College from its reception of students or not.²

Tuition fees are sums of money paid terminally or quarterly for tuition and instruction. At Oxford, the payment for tuition varies; it is generally £21 per annum, but £25 and £27 are also charged. The amount received for these fees was in 1871 £30,761 3s. 4d. To this sum additions were made in that year from the corporate and trust funds of the Colleges of £4,227 4s. 6d.

In the University of Cambridge the charge is uniform, being £18 a year or £6 a term, for an undergraduate pensioner; £2 a term for a sizar, and £1 10s. 0d. a term for every B.A. "In some cases the fund is treated as a private affair of the Tutors, and we have been frequently

¹ By a Grace passed June 1st, 1893, this tax has been supplemented by a quarterly payment of 10s.

² *Ib.* p. 30.

referred by the College for an account of it. The account has been supplied in all cases but two; those, viz. of Corpus Christi and of Sidney Sussex College. . . It appears that the amount raised by tuition fees in 13 out of the 17 Colleges was £26,413 15s. 0d., and that the Colleges contributed out of their income £1,131 6s. 3d., so that the Tutors and Lecturers are almost wholly paid by means of fees charged directly on the students for these purposes."¹

III. THE EXPENDITURE OF THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE YEAR 1871.

"The Heads of the Colleges in the two Universities receive annually £50,958 19s. 3d., whereof the Heads of the 19 Colleges in Oxford receive £30,543 12s. 4d., and the Heads of the 17 Colleges at Cambridge £20,415 6s. 11d.

"The whole amount paid to Fellows of Colleges in 1871 was £204,147 15s. 7d., of which £101,171 4s. 5d. was paid to Fellows at Oxford, and £102,976 11s. 2d. to Fellows at Cambridge. These amounts do not in all cases include the cost of allowance of various kinds made by the College."

Scholars and Exhibitioners were paid out of the corporate income of the Colleges £50,534 5s. 0d., of which £26,225 12s. 0d. was paid at Oxford, and £24,308 13s. 0d. at Cambridge. Large sums were also paid out of the Trust Funds.

£6,694 10s. 10d. was paid to University Professors at Oxford out of College incomes, and £1,011 11s. 8d. at Cambridge. Augmentation of benefices amounted at Oxford to £8,772 2s. 4d., and at Cambridge to £5,253 2s. 3d.

The cost of Management of estates was: Oxford, £8,801 18s. 0½d.; Cambridge, £6,906 6s. 6d.; equal to a percentage of £2 17s. 7d. in the first case, and £2 13s. 8d. in the second.²

A deposit is ordinarily made by each student on entrance into a College, which stands to his credit in the College books during the whole time of his undergraduate course, being available to liquidate College bills in case of default. This deposit is called Caution money.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 31, 32.

² *Ib.* p. 34.

The usual amount at Oxford is £30. The College holds these moneys, which it puts to its own use and has the benefit of any profit derived therefrom. At Cambridge the College requires a deposit to be made by each student at the time of his admission, and allows the Tutor to retain this money and employ it to his own profit. The deposit is £15 for a pensioner and £10 for a sizar. "We think that it should be clearly understood that the Tutor receives the money solely as the agent of the College, and that the College is responsible for its repayment."¹

"There is one point brought prominently out in the result of this inquiry: the great disparity between the property and income of the several Colleges and the number of its members. When that number is small, the expense of the staff and establishment is necessarily large in proportion." The Commissioners, however, did not think that it lay within their province to enter further into this subject. They confined themselves strictly to finance.

The new Statutes made both for the University and the Colleges by the Commissioners under the Act of 1877 came into force in the year 1882. The following is a comparison for Cambridge between the University and College receipts for 1883, the first year for which returns were made, and the present year 1913:—

UNIVERSITY CHEST.

			Nov. 3, 1881—			1913.		
			Sept. 29, 1882.					
			£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Rents and Dividends	3,294	1	9	1,873	11	1
Capitation Tax and Compounders' Fund	9,591	5	9	15,909	17	11
Degree Fees.....	}	...				13,693	0	0
Matriculation Fees..		...	19,688	19	6	6,273	18	0
Examination Fees ²		...				12,535	14	0
University Press				2,500	0	0
Miscellaneous	211	0	9	523	4	2
Totals			£32,785	7	9	£53,309	5	2

¹ *Ib.* p. 37.² Arranged as Senior and Junior Proctors' Fees, £10,959 15s. 0d.; Registry, £8,729 4s. 6d.

COMMON UNIVERSITY FUND.¹

				1883.			1913.		
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Assessment of Colleges	5,439	13	1	30,322	11	7
Deductions	829	5	7	7,832	13	3
				<hr/>			<hr/>		
				£4,610	7	6	£22,489	18	4
				<hr/>			<hr/>		

STOCKS BELONGING TO UNIVERSITY.

1883.			1913.		
£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
306,648	15	10	646,165	12	8

These items represent for the most part endowments ear-marked for particular purposes. Such endowments increase the teaching power of the University, but not its general resources, which it can apply as it thinks fit.

The incomes of the Colleges assessable for University purposes were :—

				1883.			1913.		
				£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Peterhouse	6,632	14	1	6,758	14	1
Clare	11,174	8	4	12,924	2	2
Pembroke	11,556	16	4	13,542	13	5
Caius	14,568	4	0	24,930	14	10
Trinity Hall	7,724	17	0	8,138	2	5
Corpus	7,343	11	4	10,810	11	4
King's	28,549	19	1	25,640	0	9
Queens'	6,827	10	3	7,843	5	11
St. Catharine's	4,904	3	7	5,719	9	6
Jesus	11,625	17	4	12,968	19	7
Christ's	10,860	17	3	12,133	17	10
St. John's	36,805	5	9	33,344	2	6
Magdalene	4,705	6	7	6,109	17	0
Trinity	46,367	9	0	55,393	0	0
Emmanuel	9,516	5	8	17,735	3	1
Sidney	7,251	13	0	10,858	10	8
Downing	4,850	9	7	7,132	9	7
				<hr/>			<hr/>		
				£231,265	8	2	£271,983	14	8
				<hr/>			<hr/>		

The gross corporate income shows a like growth, but it must be noted that the returns from the first have been for different years. In the first instance eight Colleges made returns for the year ended Michaelmas, 1882, and

¹ In 1883 the rate at which the Colleges were assessed was 24 per cent.; in 1913 it was 11½ per cent.

nine for the year ended Michaelmas, 1883. This discrepancy has continued ever since.

			1883.			1913.		
			£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Peterhouse	7,146	18	7	8,212	3	11
Clare	14,623	19	7	16,558	13	5
Pembroke	11,714	15	7	13,896	3	9
Caius	21,928	1	9	29,639	14	9
Trinity Hall	9,300	14	10	8,828	0	6
Corpus	10,038	12	1	12,325	5	7
King's	38,112	15	11	37,654	14	3
Queens'	6,871	10	7	8,686	3	1
St. Catharine's	5,526	10	4	6,063	14	11
Jesus	12,720	8	8	13,505	7	9
Christ's	14,445	15	7	14,943	7	11
St. John's	45,511	19	10	42,945	7	7
Magdalene	5,234	9	4	6,931	9	3
Trinity	78,903	0	0	76,492	2	6
Emmanuel	13,564	6	0	19,885	5	3
Sidney	7,434	18	3	14,952	11	10
Downing	6,986	16	2	9,988	12	7
			£310,065 13 1			£341,508 18 10		

Let us now compare the income of the Colleges in land, houses, and tithe in the returns for 1883 and 1913. The greatest fluctuations have taken place in these items.

An exact comparison is here impossible because of the imperfections in the College returns. Caius has never yet made a proper return. It lumps together in one total, lands on beneficial leases, and at rack-rent, houses on beneficial or long leases, and at rack-rent, copyholds, leases and tithes, a union of eight items. Its figures therefore are given separately in the previous table. In 1872, at the time of the Royal Commission, it had 656 acres of land let on beneficial lease, and houses yielding an annual income of £451, also let on beneficial lease. Its gross amount of tithe and other rent-charges was at that date £1,627.

King's also fails to make its return in the required form. It lumps together three headings into one—lands at rack-rent, houses on long leases, and houses at rack-rent. It also lumps all its Trust funds together.

Jesus has headings of its own—land rental, Cambridge house rental, London house rental, and Cambridge quit-rents. An identical form of return is given in the Statutes of all the Colleges and it ought to be followed.

(Shillings and pence omitted.)

	Lands on benef. lease. 1883. 1913.		Lands at rack-rent. 1883. 1913.		Houses on benef. lease 1883. 1913.		Houses on long leases. 1883. 1913.		Houses at rack-rent. 1883. 1913.		Tithe. 1883. 1913.		Stocks and Shares. 1883. 1913.	
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Peterhouse	—	2,744	2,245	127	258	120	365	1,063	2,157	694	438	191	555	
Clare ...	—	5,490	4,097	—	—	1,642	1,647	1,768	2,136	2,329	1,519	670	2,123	
Pembroke	—	3,876	2,644	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,247	2,063	1,330	2,156	
Trinity Hall	—	3,876	2,885	—	—	194	—	388	707	1,398	968	4	170	
Corpus	—	4,211	2,441	1,591	794	565	3,277	375	2,490	160	106	563	497	
King's...	2,059	20,107	24,297 ¹	—	—	1,112	—	570	—	10,109	6,613	863	1,471	
Queens'	171	5,181	4,544	—	—	263	130	100	85	—	—	161	211	
St. Catharine's	—	3,751	3,768	—	—	—	55	650	775	431	297	184	273	
Jesus	—	2,682	2,020	—	—	—	—	4,192	4,079	789	437	1,136	651	
Christ's	422	5,880	4,844	30	44	—	—	840	1,111	1,993	1,489	1,424	1,955	
St. John's	—	23,284	15,064	86	—	2,887	8,146	2,507	4,430	4,499	2,384	1,643	3,477	
Magdalene	—	1,331	884	—	—	—	3	396	337	1,029	650	152	344	
Trinity	2,201	18,185	22,265	—	—	583	2,533	2,384	3,624	32,468	24,237	491	561	
Emmanuel	—	4,040	2,339	115	53	3,740	8,842	1,056	1,862	469	317	1,030	805	
Sidney	—	5,105	3,027	235	90	305	7,601	460	1,005	—	—	172	529	
Downing ²	—	5,330	3,178	—	—	687	—	—	648	—	—	395	1,006	
Totals	£4,853	115,073	100,542	2,184	1,239	12,098	32,599	16,749	25,446	59,615	41,518	10,409	16,784	

Caius (first six items)

— — — — — 14,226 16,871 706 2,232

¹ This item includes Lands at rack-rent; Houses on long leases; Houses at rack-rent.² Downing has also ground-rents and rent-charges, £958; Fee-farm rents and fines; £206.

The general features of the situation are, however, clear. Beneficial leases of lands have disappeared, and beneficial leases of houses have diminished by nearly one half. There are still too many, especially at Corpus. In 1883, lands at rack-rent were beginning to feel the effects of the depression in agriculture. They have now practically got back to where they were then. Houses on long leases, and houses at rack-rent both show considerable increases, which more than make up for the depreciation in agricultural land. Tithe shows marks of the fall in prices.

The Oxford Colleges have had a like financial history. Their lands have suffered from the depression in agriculture, but there have been greatly increased receipts from house property;¹ these having risen from £36,735 in 1883 to £127,559 in 1911, a growth of £90,824, the increase being especially from houses and sites of houses let on long leases. The gross external receipts of the University and Colleges were in 1883, £318,000; in 1911, £387,000. The net external receipts at the two dates were as follows :—

Colleges.	1883.	1911.
	£	£
University	5,177	5,991
Balliol	4,881	4,669
Merton	13,877	15,706
Exeter	3,752	3,439
Oriel	5,658	4,879
Queen's	10,222	18,145
New	18,307	17,866
Lincoln	4,396	4,247
All Souls	20,446	18,983
Magdalen	23,514	37,274
Brasenose	5,827	12,595
Corpus	11,948	11,978
Christ Church	27,368	28,213
Trinity	5,196	4,352
St. John's	12,165	14,854
Jesus... ..	8,452	8,706
Wadham	4,200	2,724
Pembroke	3,492	2,405
Worcester	3,245	1,430
Total	192,123	218,456
The University	14,313	8,345
Total	£206,436	£226,801

¹ See *The Times*, May 24, 1913, with report of Mr. L. L. Price's paper, read before the Surveyors' Institution, from which the figures are taken.

The external expenditure in the same years was:—

Colleges.	1883.	1911.
	£	£
University ...	1,933	2,764
Balliol ...	1,546	1,574
Merton ...	5,280	12,970
Exeter ...	1,326	868
Oriel... ..	6,230	5,525
Queen's ...	4,431	11,065
New ...	14,146	13,816
Lincoln ...	1,357	1,855
All Souls ...	7,424	11,610
Magdalen ...	15,062	29,271
Brasenose ...	4,423	4,804
Corpus ...	7,109	4,014
Christ Church ...	21,971	31,415
Trinity ...	1,759	2,303
St. John's ...	8,489	11,583
Jesus ...	3,289	4,182
Wadham ...	1,162	2,132
Pembroke ...	342	778
Worcester ...	1,791	3,018
Total ...	109,070	155,547
The University ...	2,894	4,816
Total ...	£111,964	£160,363

The College contributions to the Common University Fund were £16,742 in 1883, and £35,867 in 1911.

Oxford and Cambridge have between them a corporate income of about three-quarters of a million. There are besides all the College and University buildings, laboratories, museums, libraries, observatories, and business premises. The capitalised value of the whole amounts to many millions.

The question for the public is whether these magnificent and constantly expanding resources are being made the best use of.

Now that the chief facts have been given, attention may be called to two recent comments on them, the one relating to Cambridge, and the other the financial chapter (Chapter VII.) in Lord Curzon's book.

The comment on the finances of Cambridge will be found in the April number of the *Quarterly Review* for

1906.¹ The article is entitled *A Plea for Cambridge*; it is written in a spirit entirely friendly to the University, and with inside knowledge. The Reviewer calls attention to the fact that Cambridge has twice appealed for outside help, once in 1898 and again in 1904. Oxford, it may be noted by the way, was compelled to do the same thing two years later. The reason in the case of Cambridge was obvious and conclusive. "Science had emptied the University Chest, yet science was still 'hungry and aggressive.' As the result of her straitened finances, Cambridge could no longer satisfy the just demands either of Science or of Letters." The writer first deals with "the belief, apparently ineradicable, that the older Universities teach and care for nothing but the ancient languages, Theology and Mathematics"; and contends that "it cannot be too often repeated that since the promulgation of the new Statutes in 1856, the University has advanced without pause to claim as her own the whole field of modern knowledge; and that it is the rapidity of her advance which has depleted her treasury." He then gives an account of the expansion of University studies since 1851. There could not well be a better summary, and it deserves the attention of all who are interested in the development of Cambridge.² The way is then open for a survey of the financial resources of the University.

"The corporate income of the seventeen Colleges is, roughly, £310,000 per annum. This, with a sum of about £52,000 (called the Tuition Fund), received annually from the Lecture and Laboratory Fees of the 3,200 students, and £30,000 received annually by the University for degrees and other fees, constitutes the whole available income for College as well as University purposes, if we except certain Trust funds for the endowment of some Professorships, and those funds of the nature of charities, of which the Colleges are merely administrators.

"The corporate income of the Colleges consists of (1) endowments, usually in the form of estates, which bring in £220,000 a year; (2) fees, rent of rooms, profits on

¹ p. 499.

² See pp. 500-510.

kitchens, and so forth, which bring in £90,000. But the Colleges are great land-owners, and have the outgoings of land-owners. Though the expenses of the estate management are only about 7 per cent. of the revenues arising from the estates, yet £130,000 a year are spent on management, repairs and improvements, rates and taxes, interest on loans, and the maintenance of the costly College buildings in Cambridge. . . . When allowance has been made for the inevitable expenditure under these heads, there is left only £180,000 for all other purposes."

The significance and importance of these facts are so great that the quotation may be broken in upon to point out that precisely the same state of things exists at Oxford. Mr. L. L. Price, in the paper mentioned above, said that the significant fact that two-fifths of the external receipts of the Colleges were absorbed by the external expenses would not surprise anybody who was acquainted with the circumstances of landed property. Rates, taxes and insurance showed a steady and considerable advance. The figure for 1911 (£32,670) was about twice that for 1883. Repairs and improvements, also, were a very heavy, if a necessary burden, and, like rates and taxes, they seemed to be ever tending upwards, the increase being from £26,000 to £48,000.

To return to the *Quarterly Reviewer*. "The Fellowships and the stipends of the Heads of Houses absorb £78,000; and the contributions of the Colleges towards Scholarships account for £32,000."

The Headships and Fellowships, be it noted, are sinecures. Not that the holders of them are on that account to be numbered among the unemployed. On the contrary, the great majority of them are very busy persons, but *qua* Heads of Houses and Fellows, they have, practically, nothing to do.

"After deduction of Fellowships and Scholarships, there is left of the corporate income a sum of £70,000. Of this sum, £32,000 (including about £10,000 capita-tion tax), or nearly one-half, is paid as a direct contribution to the University. . . . Of the £38,000 remaining, £4,000 goes to supplement the Tuition Fund of £52,000, received from the students as fees; the sum of £56,000 so

obtained is applied to the provision of College and University Lecturers. A large proportion of these fees is paid to the scientific departments of the University; and of the fees so paid the greater part is assigned as a contribution to the maintenance of the several departments, and not, directly at least, to the payment of Lecturers."

It will be noticed that the undergraduates pay for their own tuition except so far as they receive Scholarships and Exhibitions, and this in spite of the Colleges being so richly endowed. According to the latest returns¹ the following sums were paid from corporate income to Tuition Funds:—Clare, £15; Caius, £1,115; Corpus, £75; King's, £1,798; Queens', £51; St. Catharine's, £31; Jesus, £63; Christ's, £96; St. John's, £520; Trinity, £190; Emmanuel, £605; Downing, £120; a total of £4,679, an increase of £679 since 1906.

"Deducting the sum of £4,000, contributed by the Colleges to the Tuition Fund, we have left over of the corporate income a sum of £34,000, or about £2,000 per College, available for the payment of College officers and servants, interest on loans, the expenses of College libraries, printing, and other expenses. . . .

"We now turn to the question of the Fellowships. The sum of £78,000 was in 1904 divided among 17 Heads of Houses and about 315 ordinary Fellows. Of this sum the Heads of Houses received among them, as far as can be ascertained, £15,000, very unequally divided. The average stipend of a Fellow is thus about £200 per annum. When the last Commission sat, the maximum stipend of a Fellow was fixed at £250, and it was thought that this sum would usually be reached. But, except in the cases of one or two Colleges, the maximum is now never reached, and in certain cases the value of a Fellowship has fallen to less than £100 per annum. Of the 315 Fellows, some 245 were, in 1904, Resident, and some 70 Non-Resident. Of the Residents, about 225 were holding some University or College office, educational or administrative. . . . The analysis shows that the number of 'Prize Fellowships' is small; and it is believed that they are steadily vanishing.

¹ *Cambridge University Reporter*, Feb. 19, 1913.

“The University income, which has to bear almost the whole cost of modern developments, is made up of the following items: Matriculation, Degree, Examination, and other fees, £30,000; direct contributions from Colleges, £32,000; income from endowments, £2,000—£64,000 in all.

“In 1904, the University, in the course of its ordinary work, expended £65,300, distributed roughly as follows:—

	£
Officers, Secretaries, and Servants	4,100
Maintenance of Business Offices, Registry, Senate House, and Schools	1,300
Rates and Taxes	3,400
Obligatory Payments from Income	1,300
Stipends of Professors	12,400
Stipends of Readers, University Lecturers, Demonstrators, and other Teachers	9,100
Maintenance and Subordinate Staff of Scientific Depart- ments (including the Botanic Garden and Observatory)	9,600
University Library, Staff, and Upkeep	6,300
Examiners' Fees, &c.	5,900
Debt on Buildings, Sinking Fund, and Interest on Building Loans	8,500
Printing and Stationery	2,600
Pension Funds (Professors, £200; Servants, £150) ...	350
Miscellaneous Expenses	450
	<hr/>
	£65,300

“There are 44 Professors; very few of them receive £800 or more a year (including Fellowships), while the lowest limit of a Professor's stipend, unless he holds a Fellowship, is about £90 a year. The average annual income of a Professor is not more than £550; and of the yearly revenue of £24,000 required to produce this average, £7,000 are paid in the shape of Fellowships by the Colleges, and about £4,600 from the income of special Trust Funds and other benefactions, one payment of £800 being for a term of years only. One or two Professors at most receive a proportion of the fees paid for lectures and laboratories in their respective departments. There are 12 University Readers (or Sub-Professors). The new Statutes contemplated for a Reader the salary of £400 a year; but owing to the inadequacy of the University income, none receives more than £300; and in several cases only £100 is paid. There are 53 University Lecturers, whose stipends range from £200 a year to £50; and it is melancholy to note

how many of them receive the lower sum, without any assistance from endowments such as Fellowships and the like. There are 13 University Teachers, almost all of them appointed by the Board for Indian Civil Service studies, and occupied, in the main, in teaching Eastern dialects; and there are 44 Demonstrators, Curators, and Superintendents of Museums, whose stipends range from £200 a year to nothing at all.

"The incomes of some of these gentlemen are supplemented by Fellowships; of others by a share of Lecture fees; a few, too, may hold two such offices as Curator and Lecturer simultaneously. But when the addition from all sources (about £8,000 from fees or special funds, and £13,000 from Fellowships) has been made to the annual sum (£9,100) which the University has to give, we arrive at a total of about £30,000, giving the surprisingly low average income of £250 a year for any University Teacher other than a Professor. . . . There are no resources from which these incomes may be increased according to the service of the holder; and there is practically no provision for pension, except in the case of those teachers (less than one-half of the whole number) who hold Fellowships, and may expect, after many years of service, to earn the right to retain them permanently. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the University finds a difficulty in retaining many of its abler teachers."¹

Such poverty in the midst of apparent affluence is startling, but there it is.

Let us turn now to Lord Curzon's Chapter VII., the consideration of which was deferred till this point.

"The revenue and expenditure of Oxford (*i.e.* of the University and Colleges in combination) . . . are partially and not very clearly shown in the annually published abstract, drawn up according to a form prescribed by the Statute of 1882. The account is partial, because in the case of the University it only deals with those sums that pass through the University Chest, whereas there are many sources of income that are not so handled; and in the case of the Colleges, because new sources of income have accrued which are not covered by

¹ *Ib.* pp. 510-515.

the Statutes. It is the reverse of clear, because, though the figures are there, very little attempt is made to collate them or to show what the Colleges alone, or the Colleges and University in combination, are spending upon this or that object or branch of study."

Balance-sheet of the University.

The income of Oxford University is derived from (1) Endowments and the University Press, (2) Fees and Dues, (3) Trust Funds for particular purposes or institutions, and (4) College contributions.

In 1907 the gross income from these sources was £76,152 14s. 8d., and net revenue £67,885 10s. 0d., available for the payment of the Officers, Professors, Readers and Examiners, the maintenance of its Institutions, Delegacies, Offices, and Buildings, and allotments for special purposes.

From special Trust Funds there were received in 1907 the sum of £12,026. Over £3,000 of this was expended in University Scholarships. The University is merely charged with the distribution of these endowments, but they are a portion of the resources applied to educational objects.

Balance-sheet of the Colleges.

For the same year the gross receipts of the Colleges were £514,927 4s. 9d. Deducting the internal receipts, £139,977 9s. 8d., we arrive at a total gross College Income of £374,949 15s. 1d. The gross receipts from Estates were £317,525 18s. 4d. The cost of management, repairs, etc., was £134,241 6s. 7d., leaving a net revenue of £183,284 11s. 9d., and a net revenue from all sources of £240,708 8s. 6d.

The principal items, as they appear in the published Abstract, may be thus summarised:—

	£
Heads of Houses	about 21,500
Fellows	" 61,500
Scholars and Exhibitioners	" 52,900
Contributions to University purposes	" 23,000
College Officers	" 11,800
Chapels and Choirs	" 8,400
Contributions to Common University Fund...	" 6,800 "1

¹ *Principles and Methods*, pp. 141-145.

But neither do the College accounts show the full amounts annually available: *i.e.* Balliol does not publish the income derived from the recently created Balliol Trust, nor Brasenose that of the Hulme Trust, nor Hertford of the Baring Trust.

The Published Accounts.

(i) "It is impossible to ascertain from them the total sums paid partly by the University, partly by the Colleges, and partly from Trust Funds, to Professors, Readers, Lecturers, and Demonstrators. In other words, we do not know the cost of the Teaching Staff of the University.

(ii) "Neither do we know the cost or method of payment of the Teaching Staff provided by the Colleges, in the persons of its own Fellows and Tutors.

(iii) "There is no summary of the annual expenditure whether from University or College endowments, upon Scholarships, Exhibitions and Prizes."

Lord Curzon also criticises the accounts of the University Institutions, such as the Bodleian Library, and also that the University Accounts do not include the Common University Fund nor College contributions to extra-Collegiate objects. He concludes: "A system of accounts cannot be held to be perfect which is veiled in so much obscurity, and requires almost an esoteric knowledge to enable the reader to pick his way through the darkness."¹

The above remarks apply, though in a lesser degree, to Cambridge. Cambridge, for one thing, has published separate accounts of the Common University Fund from the beginning.

College Contributions to the University.

A charge has been made that, though the University is poor and the Colleges are rich, the latter do not contribute to the needs of the former so much as they ought.

In the case of all the Colleges but three, the present scale of College contributions to the University is "an initial 2 per cent. on the total net revenue, with additional progressive and cumulative percentages on net revenue in excess of £5,000, £10,000, £15,000, and £20,000."²

¹ *Ib.* pp. 145-148.

² *Ib.* p. 149.

Lord Curzon points out: (1) that of the graduated tax, "by far the greater part is paid by a very small number of Colleges"; (2) that the Colleges as a whole are far better off than when the Statute of 1882 was passed; (3) there is a lack of system and co-ordination in the manner in which the payments have been made.

Three methods of reform have been suggested:

- (1) An increase in the percentages of the College contributions.
- (2) The determination of a fixed scale of expenditure for each College, the surplus being appropriated by the University.
- (3) An increase in the statutory contributions, with power to spend some portion of it on objects approved by the University so as to interest each College in particular studies or institutions.

College Financial Administration.

"Greater system might with advantage be introduced." Each College dispenses its own revenue in its own way. Five or six Colleges in each year exhibit a loss. The remaining Colleges show credit balances, but are living as a rule very close up to their income. Colleges vary in what they charge to Internal payments. Some spend more on buildings, others on purely educational objects. One College spends from income, another raises loans. Raising a loan benefits the University, spending from income is to its detriment. Hence "it might be desirable to enact by Statute that College expenditure on repairs and improvements, external and internal, should not exceed in any one year a fixed percentage of the net income."¹ In some Colleges, Internal Receipts are used to subsidise insufficient External Receipts; in others, the kitchen or other internal charges are subsidised out of general income.

Scales of expenditure vary greatly. Three cases are given²:—

(a) College.	<i>Resident Undergraduates.</i>			<i>Cost of Servants.</i>	
Worcester	...	90	£399
Hertford	...	108	£674
Merton	...	118	£1586

¹ *Ib.* p. 155.

² *Ib.* p. 156.

(b) <i>College.</i>	<i>Resident Undergraduates.</i>			<i>College Entertainments.</i>
Wadham	...	99	...	£43
Queen's	...	119	...	£204
Trinity	...	146	...	£93

(c) <i>College.</i>	<i>Resident Undergraduates.</i>			<i>Cost of Chapel.</i>
University	...	144	...	£158
Exeter	...	162	...	£241
St. John's	...	160	...	£522

These "are the inevitable consequences of a system in which there is no controlling authority beyond the Governing Bodies of the Colleges themselves, and in which the University is powerless to intervene."¹

Management of College Estates.

It is the management of College property in houses and land which has been the target of the most sustained criticism. The reformers have made two proposals. The first is that the whole of University and College property should be sold and the Governing Bodies left with the administration solely of the resultant funds. Lord Curzon dismisses this solution as not practicable, even if desirable. But he adds that it is possible that by the sale or exchange of outlying or scattered estates the Colleges might save themselves some trouble and perhaps expense.

A more plausible suggestion is that the property of the University and Colleges might be transferred to an official body appointed by the Government, like the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who should administer it on their behalf. Lord Curzon dismisses this suggestion also. At the same time he admits the drawbacks of the present system, and sums the position up thus:—

"Just as in the case of the College contributions to University purposes and of College finances in general, we found that some exterior and controlling authority was required, so does it appear to be a desideratum in the management of those estates from which so large a portion of the College income is derived."²

Lord Curzon then gives details of the existing financial machinery at Oxford, the University Chest, and

¹ *Ib.* p. 157.

² *Ib.* pp. 160, 161.

the Common University Fund, and also of the working of the University Press. This leads up to a consideration of the

Financial Policy of the University.

“We have previously compared the Hebdomadal Council to the Cabinet of the University, *i.e.* a Committee appointed by the Congregation to represent the Executive, to shape policy, and to initiate legislation. If the analogy were perfect, we might expect that this body would have supreme control over the University finances, and would possess a Finance Minister of its own, who would provide and co-ordinate the means for carrying out its policy and conducting the general work of the University, and who would frame an annual Budget for that purpose. But the very opposite is the case. The University has no one Treasury (but a number of semi-independent Treasuries), no Chancellor of the Exchequer, and no Budget. Council cannot spend a farthing; it cannot even order a farthing to be spent. All it can do is to submit proposals for expenditure to Convocation. If an application is made to it by a Department for new expenditure of a permanent kind, or if it has itself decided upon any policy that involves the expenditure of money, its usual course is to send to the Chest, and ask if the means are forthcoming. But the Chest is not itself primarily an instrument for carrying out the policy of the Government; it does not busy itself with policy at all. . . The Chest therefore may, and often does, return a negative reply. In that case Council may still submit a decree to Convocation, or it may turn for assistance to the Common University Fund. But the Fund is itself a self-contained and independent body, and may also refuse. . .

“The public spirit and common sense of all the parties concerned have alone enabled this system to work without any conspicuous breakdown. But it must be obvious that it is strangely lacking in co-ordination, and that the absence of a central financial authority, representing the Government of the University, and invested with a sufficient control over all its funds, is a source of weakness and delay. . . The need of such central control has been rendered still more urgent by the growth of numerous and powerful departments inside

the University, constituted for teaching purposes, but invested with financial powers.”¹ To meet these difficulties Lord Curzon describes his

Suggested Board of Finance.

Lord Curzon rejects the amalgamation of the Chest and the Common Fund on the grounds (1) that it would involve the creation of a body inconveniently large, and which would sacrifice efficiency to comprehensiveness; and (2) that it would be difficult to adjust the relations of such a body to the Council, which might easily find itself overshadowed. At Cambridge, however, there has been this amalgamation from the first under the Financial Board.

His own suggestion is that “there should be created a new Committee or Board of Finance of moderate dimensions, of independent character, and possessed of adequate powers. . . . Some outside authority is required (*a*) to elucidate and correlate University and College accounts; (*b*) to exercise advisory and supervisory powers in connexion with the financial administration of both, but of the Colleges in particular, more especially with relation to the assignment of College contributions to University purposes; (*c*) to exercise similar functions with regard to the management both of University and College estates; (*d*) above all, to vivify the financial policy of the University.”

A Statute creating a Board of Finance was passed by Convocation on March 5th, 1912, the vote being *placets* 133, *non-placets* 26. The text of it appears in the Oxford² University Gazette of the following day and is given below. From it the reader can gather how far Lord Curzon has been successful in getting what he wanted.

¹ *Ib.* pp. 165-167.

² 1. There shall be a Board of Finance, which shall consist of nine members of Convocation, of whom three shall be nominated by the Chancellor, three shall be elected by the Hebdomadal Council, and three shall be elected by Convocation.

2. The members of the Board shall be appointed in Michaelmas Term, and shall enter on office on the first day of January next following the date of their appointment. They shall hold office for six years, one of the three persons in each class vacating office every second year.

3. If a member of the Board shall die, or shall resign, another member of Convocation shall be appointed in his place in the same manner in which the said member was appointed. He shall enter on

office at once, but shall hold office for the unexpired residue only of the period of office of the person whom he succeeds.

4. No member of the Board nominated by the Chancellor shall serve for more than twelve years in all.

5. No member of the Board elected by the Hebdomadal Council or by Convocation who has served for a full period of six years shall be qualified to enter upon another period of office until after the lapse of a year.

6. The Vice-Chancellor and the Proctors, if they are not members of the Board, shall nevertheless have the right to attend and speak at all meetings of the Board or its Committees, and shall be summoned thereto, and shall receive copies of all papers submitted to the Board or its Committees.

7. The Board shall appoint annually one of its members to be Chairman.

8. The Secretary to the Curators of the University Chest shall be Secretary to the Board.

9. The Board shall have power to obtain such professional and clerical assistance as it may from time to time require on such terms as shall seem proper to the Board; and the expenses thus incurred shall be defrayed by the Curators of the University Chest.

10. The Board shall meet not less than four times a year and all its meetings shall be held in Oxford. Five members shall form a quorum.

11. The duties of the Board shall be—

(a) In each academical year, to prepare, on the basis of information received from the Curators of the University Chest and from the Delegates of the University Press and from the Hebdomadal Council, an estimate of income and expenditure of the University for the calendar year following, and to forward the same to the Hebdomadal Council before the beginning of Michaelmas Term; and at the same time, and at any other time when it may think fit, to make recommendations to the Council as to the best means of making further provision, if required, to meet the estimated expenditure of the University, and generally to advise the Hebdomadal Council as to financial administration of the University.

(b) To review annually the published accounts of the University, and of all Institutions, Delegacies, Boards, and Committees of the University, to report to the Hebdomadal Council thereon, and to make recommendations with a view more particularly to the economical administration of the properties or moneys concerned and the suitable disposal of surplus income.

(c) To prepare annually for submission to the Hebdomadal Council, and for publication by the same, (1) a statement of the whole receipts and expenditure of the University together with those of the Colleges collectively during the preceding year, showing the sources of such receipts and the manner in which the payments have been distributed among various heads of expenditure, and also (2) a statement of the total amount of the contributions and other payments made by the Colleges collectively during the year for University purposes and of the objects to which this amount has been applied; (3) a statement of—

A. The revenue of each College taxable for University purposes after deducting protected revenue, excepted by the Commissioners in University Statutes Tit. XIX. § 16. cl. 2.

B. The amount which each College is liable to pay on this revenue under the graduated Income-tax established by the

Commissioners in Statute Tit. XIX. § 16. cl. 4, before deductions are made under Statute Tit. XIX. § 16. cl. 7, or in case of the Colleges exempted from the graduated tax, the amount to which each would have been liable, if the graduated tax had applied to that College.

C. The payments (whether made to the Common Fund or otherwise) by which each College discharges the said obligations.

D. The amount paid by each College for any University purpose beyond the *minimum* prescribed for it by the graduated Income-tax

(i) in fulfilment of other obligations imposed on it by the Commissioners;

(ii) by way of voluntary contribution.

- (d) To review annually the published accounts of the several Colleges and, after communication with any College concerned, to report to the Hebdomadal Council thereon, with special reference to economy of administration and to any matter in which the interests of the University are directly or indirectly involved.
- (e) To consider from time to time the statutory and other contributions made by the Colleges to University purposes, and, if it thinks fit, to advise the Hebdomadal Council as to any action on these matters by the Council that may appear desirable.
- (f) To consider from time to time the forms in which University and College accounts are prepared and published, and to advise the Hebdomadal Council thereon.
- (g) To confer, at the request of the Hebdomadal Council or of the Body concerned, with any University Body or with the Governing Body of any College, for the proper carrying out of the above objects, and to consider any representations that may be made to it by any of these Bodies.
- (h) To take into consideration any question of finance referred to it by the Hebdomadal Council, and to advise the Hebdomadal Council thereon.
- (i) To perform any other duties of advice and supervision connected with the financial administration of the University which may from time to time be assigned to it by any Statute of the University.

CHAPTER XII.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A SCHEME OF REFORM FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

The phrase, "University Reform," is made up of two apparently simple words, but it will be well at the outset to come to a clear understanding as to what precisely is meant by them. The functions of a University are generally held to be three: (1) to impart instruction, (2) to give facilities for acquiring knowledge, (3) to add to the sum of existing knowledge; in other words, a University has been looked upon as a place for (1) Teaching, (2) Learning, and (3) Research. Most persons will agree that it ought to be a place for all three. In that case it is important to determine the order of these functions: which shall come first and be pre-eminent, and which shall be subordinate. Mark Pattison held that Oxford and Cambridge should be first and foremost seats of learning, the homes of learned men, who by their mere existence would raise the whole tone of the national life; Research to him came next; Teaching was to be practised rather because it benefited the teacher than because it benefited the taught. Newman, as we have seen, thought that Research was altogether out of place at a University.¹

Practical people, however, will be content to take things as they find them. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, as they now exist, are teaching institutions. They foster Learning, and they do something for Research; but these things are subordinate to their main work of imparting instruction, examining men in it, and giving degrees according to the results. University Reform, then, is here taken to mean primarily making the Universities as efficient teaching institutions as possible.

¹ See the characteristic passage in his *Idea of a University*, pp. xiii-xiv.

This being granted, University Reform may be divided into three branches. It means increasing to a maximum the efficiency of the Universities by (1) bringing them into right relations with the Colleges, and the Colleges into right relations with one another; (2) giving the Universities a proper Constitution, or system of self-government; and (3) bringing the Universities as thus reformed into right relations with the rest of our system of national education. This country possesses Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Grammar Schools, Local Universities, National Universities. Its system of education, so far as it possesses one, is built up of these different parts. These all should be brought into right relations with one another, and communication between them should be as easy as possible. Then England will possess a properly organised system of education. The problem therefore is one of internal organisation and external adjustment.

In this adjustment the interests of the nation must be paramount. The internal organisation must come before the external adjustment. Oxford and Cambridge cannot, in their present shape, be fitted into a national system. The reason is that they are not Universities like a Scottish, a German, or an American University, but Universities of Colleges, or Corporations of Corporations; that is to say, collections of practically independent bodies. True, there is more co-operation and correlation than there was between University and College, and College and College, but there is no organic unity, and the time has come when the University must achieve that unity by the co-ordination of the Colleges. The external adjustment can then be effected. Such adjustment is obviously impossible while there are 21 separate Colleges at Oxford and 17 at Cambridge. These 38 institutions cannot each by itself be fitted into a national system.

SECTION I. RELATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COLLEGES.

University Reform, in the first place, is a problem in Federalism, and the difficulty to be faced is that which always crops up in this case,—how to reconcile the claims of the central authority with those of the constituent parts. There may be some who will altogether deny this

view of the matter. Had Mark Pattison been alive it is probable he would have done so. He says¹: "We have learnt that there is no conflict of objects or interests between the Colleges and the University—that they are, in fact, the same men under a different denomination. . . We hear no more of the old complaint of the usurpation of University functions by the Colleges."²

Two criticisms may be made upon this statement. It is not as accurate as it once was to say that the University and the Colleges are the same men under a different denomination. Cambridge has of late years been constantly reinforcing the ranks of the teachers at Oxford, and Oxford has in one or two cases returned the compliment. Besides this, Cambridge has drawn teachers from other Universities, or gone for them outside the Universities altogether. Such persons may be made members of a College, but their feelings for the University will tend to prevail over their feelings for the College in which they are incorporated.

Again, even if the two classes were identical, they might still hold different views as to the relations which the Colleges ought to bear to the University. The inhabitants of the several States make up collectively, and are identical with, the inhabitants of the United States of America; but from the first there have been two parties among them; the Republicans, emphasising the need of a strong central government; and the Democrats, anxious before all things to safeguard the rights of the individual States. When Mark Pattison wrote the above words in 1868 the first Elementary Education Act had not been passed, and two years had to elapse before it became law. Of organisation in Secondary Education there was none. Since then so much progress has been made that the Government is at this moment said to be contemplating a great unifying measure which is to give us a national system of education. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge cannot be left outside such a scheme, and thus the whole question of their organisation bids fair speedily to become a living issue. In the

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 46, 47.

² The passage is given more fully above at pp. 98, 99.

discussion which the raising of that issue will bring, the relations of the Colleges to the University must hold a prominent place. Before long we may have our Republican and Democratic parties at Oxford and Cambridge, each with a definite principle to advocate, and definite interests to protect.

In endeavouring thus to mark out the battle-field I am only too well aware that it means choosing the line of the greatest resistance. The Colleges are naturally jealous of their independence and of their separate interests, and they may be expected to fight vigorously against any interference with their present status. Lord Curzon has been quoted in Chapter X. as holding that the reconciliation of the Colleges with the University is the most difficult of all University problems. He makes it quite plain where the difficulty lies. "It needs but a small acquaintance with Oxford men to recognise that while the University has many claims upon their affection, the College, as a rule, has much greater. In the College feeling we have the most powerful sentiment to which we can appeal; . . . and any attempt to injure or subvert the Colleges, even in the interests of the University, would excite widespread resentment." No sane person would wish to injure the Colleges, much less to subvert them; but he can provoke quite enough opposition to satisfy him far short of that. The Cambridge Committee, alluded to in the same chapter, agreed on many things, yet when they came to consider the provision of further University teaching, were "of opinion that they were not in a position to consider the requirements of the different studies"; and as to methods of paying for such teaching, they "make no positive suggestion, and leave to the several special Boards the duty of bringing forward proposals as they may become necessary."¹ In other words, they abandon the problem to others, regarding it as insoluble so far as they themselves were concerned.

But difficult as the question is, it will have to be faced. Encouragement is to be derived from the progress of events. It is true that Parliament in the Acts of 1854 and 1856 did not dare to put in force the recommen-

¹ *Report*, p. 13.

dations of the Commissioners with regard to University teaching, but what the timidity of our legislators failed to effect is coming about by the natural development of the newer studies. Sir William Hamilton long ago foresaw that the Natural Sciences would have to be taught by the University. They are very expensive subjects, and the necessary laboratories, museums, and workshops, with all their costly specimens, materials and apparatus, are beyond the means of any individual College to provide upon anything like a sufficient scale. Three Colleges at Cambridge, St. John's, Caius, and Sidney, started laboratories of their own. They have all three closed them as such, and the work is concentrated in the University buildings.

Then again, the Act of 1877 established the right of the Universities to levy a tax on College property, a constitutional advance of the greatest significance. For this, Science again is mainly responsible. The University in its poverty was unable to meet the demands of a subject always aggressive and hungry for more. There was nothing for it but to take toll of Collegiate riches. The outstanding fact then of academical history during the last sixty years is the growing power of the University. It had always retained the right of examining and giving degrees, of public discipline, and a portion of the teaching. It has gained a larger proportion of the teaching and the right of taxation. The principles embodied in these achievements have but to be carried to their logical conclusion, and a unified University must be the result. Will the Colleges have wisdom to discern the signs of the times?

Parenthetically, it may be remarked, that opinion at Oxford seems to be more advanced than at Cambridge. Lord Curzon writes¹: "We find the reformers of 1850 engaged in the attempt to reanimate and re-enthroned the University as against the alleged encroachments of the Collegiate system, and we recognise the same note in the utterances of the present day." And again:² "Nevertheless the complaint that the Colleges still dominate the University has been actively revived and is in the forefront

¹ *Principles*, p. 16.

² *Ib.* p. 121.

of every call for University Reform." Reformers at Cambridge have not been so definite in their statements.

It thus becomes necessary to examine the Collegiate system and its working somewhat in detail, that both its merits and defects may be made plain. A College is a many-sided institution, being at once a University in little, a Boarding-School and an Athletic and Social Club, and it cannot be fully understood unless all these aspects of it are kept in view.

It is as teaching institutions that the Colleges try to be Universities on their own account. Each admits members on its own terms, compels them to attend its own courses of instruction, and rewards them with distinctions and offices.

The following is a list of the Cambridge Colleges, with the number of undergraduates on their books, and some particulars as to their finances for the academic year 1912-3:—

	No. of Under- graduates. ¹	Gross Corporate income (apart from Trust Funds).			Assessment for University purposes. ²		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Trinity	672	76,492	2	6	55,393	0	0
Caius	327	29,639	14	9	24,930	14	10
Pembroke	293	13,896	3	9	13,542	13	5
St. John's	244	42,945	7	7	33,344	2	6
Christ's	227	14,943	7	11	12,133	17	10
Jesus	212	13,505	7	9	12,968	19	7
Clare	201	16,558	13	5	12,924	2	2
Emmanuel	192	19,885	5	3	17,735	3	1
Queens'	181	8,686	3	1	7,843	5	11
King's	166	37,654	14	3	25,640	0	9
Trinity Hall	146	8,828	0	6	8,138	2	5
St. Catharine's	129	6,063	14	11	5,719	9	6
Downing	116	9,988	12	7	7,132	9	7
Magdalene	115	6,931	9	3	6,109	17	0
Sidney	112	14,952	11	10	10,858	10	8
Corpus	85	12,325	5	7	10,810	11	4
Peterhouse	81	8,212	3	11	6,758	14	1
Totals		341,508	18	10	271,983	14	8

¹ See the University Calendar for 1912-13. Objection may be raised to these figures on the ground that the Colleges do not all make their returns on the same basis, *i.e.* some of them count in as on their books those who are coming into residence in the following October, and some do not; but the totals, however made up, are sufficiently accurate for the purposes of the present argument.

² *University Reporter*, November 5th, 1912, p. 190.

It will be seen that in point of numbers Trinity is more than twice as large as the next largest College, and more than eight times larger than the smallest College.

There is a like disparity in the resources at the disposal of the Colleges. Trinity has a gross corporate income nearly thirteen times as large as that of St. Catharine's. If we perform the operation on which Mark Pattison poured such scorn, but for which we can plead the high authority of the late Marquis of Salisbury,—divide the pence by the pupils—the following are the results in round figures:—

						Yearly Income per Undergraduate.
						£
King's	227
St. John's	176
Corpus	133
Sidney	133
Trinity	114
Peterhouse	101
Emmanuel	100
Caius	90
Downing	86
Clare	82
Trinity Hall	68
Christ's	66
Jesus	64
Magdalene	60
Pembroke	50
Queens'	48
St. Catharine's	47

Taking the last three Colleges as approximately equal, King's has roughly four and three-quarters times as much corporate income per undergraduate as Pembroke, Queens' and St. Catharine's; St. John's has three and a half; Corpus and Sidney two and three-quarters; Trinity two and a half; and Peterhouse and Emmanuel double. Looking at the same facts from another point of view, if King's could make its endowments go as far as St. Catharine's does, it could educate about 800 undergraduates instead of 166. The significant point is that rich Colleges are, as a rule, expensive; and poor Colleges, cheap. A large endowment does not necessarily mean education at a low rate.

Now let us turn to the Boarding-School aspect of the Colleges. The Colleges are rival institutions, and like to have their houses full. With all their endowments they would have difficulty in paying their way if they were not full. Accordingly they compete with one another in the open market, and each endeavours to attract to itself the most promising members of the successive generations of would-be students. The method in which they compete deserves attention. Every year, in the first week in December, two wealthy and powerful groups enter the field. Trinity, Clare, and Trinity Hall make up the one; St. John's, Caius, King's, Pembroke, Emmanuel, Christ's, and Jesus compose the other.¹ The first group has behind it a corporate income of £100,000 a year, the second of £135,000, a grand total of £235,000 out of the £341,508. These combinations between them reap practically the whole of the harvest. The other Colleges come straggling in one by one, and glean the scanty ears which their richer rivals have left untouched.²

The results are striking and peculiar. Mr. J. A. Venn, who has given great attention to University statistics, published some tables in the *Cambridge Review* for January 23rd and 30th, 1908, from which the following figures are taken.

The period 1851-1906 is selected because 1851 was the first year in which there was a free choice of more than one Honour course. The number of Honour degrees taken at each College during this period is represented as a percentage of the total Matriculations from 1848 to 1903, because as the University course is normally for three years, the undergraduate who matriculated in 1848 may for purposes of calculation be held to have taken his degree in 1851.

¹ King's has recently dropped out, and now holds its Entrance Scholarship Examination independently.

² If this paragraph is thought too severe the plea may be put in that Mark Pattison says the same thing (*Suggestions*, p. 66), when he points out the effect of the division of the University into independent, and, for this purpose, rival houses. "Every College is desirous to have its rooms full, and every College is desirous of showing as many University honours as it can. Consequently the Colleges outbid each other in the general market for talent. If one College raises its Scholarships to £100 a year, the others must go as far in the same direction as their means will allow."

HONOURS. TABLE A (1851—1906).

College.	Total Honours.	Percentage to Matriculations.
King's ¹	965	91·8
Sidney	547	64·3
St. Catharine's	412	54·9
Christ's	1,078	54·6
Downing	223	52·9
St. John's	2,643	52·0
Pembroke	942	50·2
Emmanuel	956	50·1
Queens'	490	48·4
Caius	1,242	48·3
Peterhouse	424	47·8
Trinity	4,265	46·2
Clare	760	39·8
Corpus	583	34·7
Magdalene	282	31·9
Jesus	624	30·6
Trinity Hall	648	27·0
Fitzwilliam Hall ²	154	7·2

Mr. Venn gives a second table showing the figures for the five years, 1902-6 inclusive, calculated on the same basis.

HONOURS. TABLE B (1902—6).

College.	Honour Degrees.	Percentage to Matriculations.
King's	187	76·9
Downing	33	66·0
Sidney	82	65·6
Peterhouse	43	63·2
St. Catharine's	49	62·0
Caius	184	55·4
Magdalene	31	55·3
St. John's	206	54·9
Christ's	135	54·8
Emmanuel	165	54·2
Pembroke	188	51·3
Jesus	83	49·7
Queens'	72	49·6
Corpus	41	43·1
Trinity	345	36·7
Clare	107	36·5
Trinity Hall	59	24·3
Fitzwilliam Hall	32	13·4

¹ It must be borne in mind that King's besides giving an education of such superior quality, has to maintain its very expensive chapel and choir.

² Fitzwilliam Hall in all three tables represents the Non-Collegiate or Unattached Students.

Let us next look at the Poll Degrees as given by Mr. Venn:—¹

TABLE C. POLL DEGREES, 1902—6.

College.	Poll Degrees.	Percentage to Matriculations.
St. Catharine's ...	40	50·6
Downing ...	23	46·0
Peterhouse ...	30	44·1
Corpus ...	39	41·0
Queens' ...	59	40·5
Trinity ...	363	38·6
Emmanuel ...	108	35·1
Clare ...	102	34·8
Christ's ...	85	34·5
Caius ...	105	31·6
Pembroke ...	116	31·6
Jesus ...	53	31·3
St. John's ...	115	30·6
Sidney ...	36	28·8
Trinity Hall ...	68	28·1
Fitzwilliam Hall ...	57	24·0
Magdalene ...	10	17·6
King's ...	30	12·3

Mr. Venn inserts in his tables Cavendish Hostel, which is now extinct, and Selwyn which is not on the same footing as the other Colleges. His University totals are thus: Honours 44·4 for the fifty years, and Poll Degrees 32·9 or 77·3 combined.

It will be seen that during the longer period less than half the students obtained a degree in Honours. The shorter and more recent period only shows an increase of 1·9 in this percentage. It is still under the half. The rest, if they take a degree at all, have to be content with a Poll degree, *i.e.* a degree taken on work which for the most part ought to be, and could be, better done at school. "Since about 1820," writes Mr. Venn,² "the proportion of students taking a degree has remained constant in the neighbourhood of 77 per cent." In other words, 23 per cent. of the Cambridge undergraduates disappear without taking a degree at all. There must always be a leakage, owing to ill-health, parental misfortunes, and other unavoidable causes, but when

¹ *Cambridge Review*, Vol. XXIX., p. 196.

² *Oxford and Cambridge Matriculations*, p. 13.

allowance has been made for everything of this kind, 23 per cent. remains a very high proportion of failures. The Colleges, as has been pointed out, have got into their hands practically the entire regulation of the terms of admission to the University, the number of Non-Collegiate students being too small to affect the general result. Some of the fruits of this system are made manifest by the figures just given.

A fourth table, which I compiled in 1907, shows the number of First Classes taken by members of the various Colleges during the ten years, 1898-1907.

To take the last table first. The power of wealth is here apparent. The richer Colleges can buy the first class men, the poorer Colleges only get them by a lucky chance. What can Magdalene, Corpus and St. Catharine's do against Trinity, St. John's, King's and Caius? King's, Trinity and St. John's do well, but their work is very expensive.

The other tables show some extraordinary divergencies. Taking Table B, Trinity may be able to buy First Classes, but its percentage of Honours to Matriculations, 36·7, is very low, and shows that it wastes its magnificent resources by admitting too many Poll men, its percentage of Poll men, 38·6, being higher than the percentage of Honour men. Poll and Honour men between them account for 75·1 of the entries, showing that just a quarter of the Trinity undergraduates go down without taking a degree. There is a great discrepancy between 91·8 and 27, the highest and the lowest figures in Table A, and between 76·9 and 24·3, the corresponding figures in Table B, a proof of very different work being done by the Colleges. Some are doing extremely well, others are doing decidedly badly. The reader can sort out the separate examples for himself.

A College which has not wealth can compete for entries with inducements of a different kind,—a reputation for success in athletics, or for an easy discipline, or both. Thus Mr. Charles Tennyson says¹: "College A has risen in the last ten years, since its acquisition of a prominent football player as Tutor, from 150 to nearly 250 under-

¹ *Cambridge from Within*, p. 68.

Tripas.	Trin.	St. John's	King's	Catus	Pemb.	Emm.	Christ's	Jesus	Sidney	Clare	Queens'	Trin H.	Pet.	Down.	Mag.	Corpus	S. Cath.
Mathematical	78	46	11	19	19	12	11	19	9	18	11	5	7	—	4	2	1
Classical	65	26	47	25	41	20	25	22	11	4	5	1	1	—	2	—	—
Moral Sciences	5	3	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Natural Sciences	68	63	33	33	9	35	24	9	32	25	3	7	7	15	2	3	—
Theological ...	1	4	—	2	6	5	1	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Law	5	6	1	4	2	1	—	3	—	—	—	6	—	1	—	—	—
Historical	12	6	15	1	1	3	—	4	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Oriental Languages	—	2	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Med. & Modern Languages	5	2	2	6	2	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mechanical Sciences	15	2	7	4	6	3	3	1	2	1	1	2	—	—	—	—	—
Economics ...	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals ...	255	160	117	96	86	80	67	64	56	49	22	21	17	16	8	5	1

graduates. He adds¹: "When everything is said, the mechanism of work at the University is as nothing compared with the vast machinery of play." Mr. Arthur Gray, in his book, *Jesus College*, has the following passage²: "In 1875 the College boat attained the proud position of Head of the River. It kept it for the unexampled space of eleven years. . . The inflow of freshmen became phenomenal; in 1878 they numbered eighty-seven, in the next year seventy-four. These numbers were never again equalled. . . After 1890, Jesus lost its athletic predominance, and since then has suffered a decline in numbers." This is where the Athletic Club side of a College comes in.

The Colleges show great differences not only in size and income, but also in tone and temper. A striking illustration of this fact is the recent vote of the Senate on the question of throwing open the Divinity Degrees to persons other than members of the Church of England. It was taken on November 22nd, 1912, when the votes were: In favour of removing the restriction, 434; against removing it, 323; majority in favour, 111.

The following are the figures for the separate Colleges:—

CLASS I. *Colleges in favour of removal.*

		For.	Against.
Christ's	28	5
King's	44	9
Downing	11	3
Selwyn	7	2
Magdalene	5	2
Caius	38	16
Trinity Hall	14	7
Jesus	13	8
Peterhouse	14	10
St. John's	66	40
Trinity	113	72
Emmanuel	25	18

CLASS II. *Colleges against removal.*

		Against.	For.
St. Catharine's	22	3
Corpus	35	6
Queens'	14	8
Pembroke	24	13
Clare	17	14

¹ *Ib.* p. 166.

² pp. 229, 234.

CLASS III. *College equally divided.*

	For.	Against.
Sidney Sussex ...	7	7

The voting at St. Catharine's was 7 to 1 in favour of tests; at Corpus, 6 to 1; at Christ's it was $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 against tests; and at King's 5 to 1. Those who love darkness rather than light, those who love light rather than darkness, and those who like the two blended in an indistinguishable twilight can thus be all equally well suited.

Another remarkable feature in the history of the Colleges is the extraordinary fluctuations in their numbers both when these are taken at longer and shorter intervals of time. In Cooper's *Annals of Cambridge*¹ there is given a list of the Headships, Fellowships, Scholarships, and Exhibitions in the several Colleges, and the number of Students on the Buttery tables on Commencement Day, 1727. The total number of Students was 1,499. St. John's was conspicuously at the top with 351,—nearly a third of the whole University, while it had 60 Fellowships, 100 Scholarships, and 100 Exhibitions. It has spent not far short of two hundred years in falling from the first place to the fourth with 244 undergraduates. Trinity during the same period has gone up from 227 undergraduates to 672. Thus while the one College has decreased by a third, the other has multiplied itself three times over. There have been other fluctuations by the way. Forty years ago the numbers at St. John's were still 421, in 1905 they were 221, in 1907 they were 315. In 1898 Trinity reached 709, by 1904 it had dropped to 629, while it surpassed the 700 limit again in 1907 (701) and has now gone down to 672. Many further examples of these fluctuations may be found in Mr. J. A. Venn's *Statistical Chart* and the descriptive Text issued therewith. "In 1865, Corpus took the place of Caius, and was, for some three or four years, actually third in order of magnitude." It is now bottom but one with 85 undergraduates. "Jesus College was the next to take this precedence, rising rapidly from a very low position. . . Speaking of Pembroke, it is interesting to find that the familiar legend as to the entry there in 1862 being confined to a single freshman

¹ Vol. V., p. 504.

is true in fact. Moreover it is also true that he migrated to Caius, owing no doubt to loneliness. . . Trinity Hall for centuries humbly reposed at, or close to, the bottom in point of size. Then almost at a bound it rose to the head of the second rank.”¹ And so instances might be multiplied. The College endowments do not fluctuate in the same manner. They remain pretty constant in comparison with the endowments of their neighbours. The mischief of the fluctuations then is this amongst others: at one time when the numbers are low, the financial resources are wasted, the machinery is being driven with too light a load; at another time when the numbers go up with a bound, the machinery may be overloaded and the resources of the College unduly strained. A slow and steady expansion is as desirable in a College as it is in a commercial enterprise. When the numbers fall below the proper level, the College is not doing its duty as an educational body, and national education suffers accordingly. The 1872 Commissioners were alive to these facts, as shown by their words which have been previously quoted:—

“There is one point brought prominently out in the result of this inquiry, the great disparity between the property and income of the several Colleges and the numbers of the members. When that number is small, the expense of the staff and establishment is necessarily large in proportion.”²

This point of the number of students deserves further consideration. Let us suppose a College has forty-eight undergraduates in residence. This is no unfair figure. In 1905 Magdalene had forty-two undergraduates on its books, and these were not necessarily all in residence. Of our forty-eight some will be “Honours men” reading for a Tripos, others will be “Poll men” reading for a Pass degree. We will assume that there are twenty-four of each sort. As the University course is normally for three years, let there be eight men in each year reading for Honours. As there are eleven Triposes it will not be possible to find a man per year for each of them. Let us therefore cut down the number of Triposes for which

¹ *Descriptive Text*, pp. 10-11.

² *Report*, p. 37.

there are men reading to four, the Natural Sciences, Mathematical, Classical and Historical, and let us suppose them to be equally attractive. Each will require several teachers if the instruction in it is to be adequate. How can so large a staff be economically provided for such an infinitesimal number of men as two per Tripos? As there are many varieties of the Pass degree, the same line of argument will apply to the Poll men.

We may also make a further examination of Magdalene as it was in 1905. To teach its forty-two undergraduates, to watch over their welfare, and to rouse in them a spirit of emulation, it had a Master, a President, a Tutor, an Assistant Tutor, three Lecturers, a Bursar, a Steward, a Dean, a Chaplain, a Praelector, a Librarian, and five Fellows. As a matter of fact there were seven people to fill the seventeen posts, or one official for every six undergraduates.

Taking the offices in gross in 1907, the Colleges (including Selwyn and the Non-Collegiates) were managed by 28 Masters, Vice-Masters and Presidents, 57 Tutors, 205 Lecturers, 54 Directors or Supervisors of Studies, 25 Deans and sub-Deans, 29 Bursars and Treasurers, 4 Auditors, 16 Praeceptors, 19 Librarians, 17 Chaplains, Catechists and Readers, 16 Stewards, 8 Organists and Choirmasters, 1 Head-Examiner, and 1 Registry—a total of 480 officials of one kind or another. Many of these persons hold more than one office, but when full allowance has been made for duplication, it is still true that the system is cumbrous and costly. No one would dream of setting it up, if he were starting *de novo*. Such then are some of the results of each College striving to be a University on its own account. It may be magnificent, but it is not economical education.

Facts like those mentioned above have not been without their effect. Since 1856 great strides have been made in the direction of cooperation between the Colleges. Some account of these will be given later on. Meantime the question arises as to what is the logical outcome of this policy. Cooperation had admittedly not been carried as far as it is either possible or desirable. How far, it may be asked, is that? The growing power of the University, increased Inter-Collegiate action—these

are the outstanding features of the last 60 years. Putting the two together, is not the result certain in the end to be a unified University?

There is thus encouragement to ask where the essence of the College system lies, because if that can be preserved, opposition will be diminished, and the path of less, if not of least, resistance at length be open. There will be no dispute that it lies in its Tutorial and domestic functions. A College was in its origin a house or home for students. English opinion shrinks from the homeless condition of the undergraduates in Edinburgh or Berlin. It likes to think of them as safely housed under protecting and guiding influences. It may be that it idealises Oxford and Cambridge in this respect, but the belief is still strong in "the truly invaluable element of the College system—the close action of the teacher on the pupil, of the matured character on the unformed, of the instructed on the learning mind, not without a very beneficial reaction of the young on the aging man."¹ So, too, Lord Curzon speaks of "the inestimable advantages of the College system, with its associations of mingled tenderness and pride, and the moral influence of its society and training," of "the endurance of the Collegiate ideal" as "one of the most remarkable and the most eloquent features of modern Oxford," of "the indescribable glamour of College Society"; and, again, of "the wonderful growth of personal tuition which has sprung up in our midst almost unawares, and has provided the student with an instructor—half master and half friend."

The College officer *par excellence* is the Tutor, and the two things which make a College are the Tutorial system and the corporate life. If these are preserved, everything else is of secondary importance. Assuming, then, that a College performs three kinds of work, (1) Administrative, (2) Educational, and (3) Tutorial, these are here arranged in an ascending order of importance.

The centralisation of College administration should thus be the least difficult part of the problem of a unified

¹ Pattison, *Suggestions*, p. 78. Pattison draws a distinction between (1) the tutorial and (2) the domestic influence. His eloquent words refer to (1). The domestic influence, *i.e.* the association of undergraduates with one another (for there is little contact between them and their seniors), he describes as neither "ascetic nor purifying."

University. The chief administrative officers are the Bursar and the Steward, the one looking after the College property and finances, the other after its internal economy. The undergraduates very often do not know who the College Bursar is. They may occasionally come across the Steward if the custom of the College allows representatives of their number to complain to him about the dinner in Hall. Bursars and Stewards are practically outside the corporate life, or so little in it that both might disappear without the Collegiate system being seriously affected. The same may be said of the Tutors so far as they take Caution money, send out College bills and receive payment of them.

Lord Curzon, at the end of his chapter on the Revenue and Expenditure of the University of Oxford,¹ formulates a weighty conclusion: "As I have advanced further in the study of the subject, it has been borne in upon me with increasing conviction that the clue to the majority of University problems, and the condition of the majority of University reforms, is finance: that financial reform means financial control: and that until such control is established decisive progress cannot be made." If then finance is of such importance to the University, and of so little importance to the essence of the Collegiate system, we may pass to the consideration of it with some degree of confidence.

The 17 Cambridge Colleges have between them 29 Bursars and Treasurers and 4 Auditors. Each Bursar has his own room or rooms, and his clerk or clerks. A College has also its firm of solicitors and its land agent or agents, to speak of no other necessary officials. If all the work here indicated were done in common, obviously it could be done more cheaply and better, because the level of the worst work could be brought up to the level of the best. The Bursar's Office never seems quite to fit in with the rest of the College. The aim of the institution is educational, not financial, and there is an inappropriateness in taking a scholar from his proper work and setting him to purely commercial operations. To argue thus is to repeat what has often been said before.

¹ *Principles and Methods*, p. 171.

Mark Pattison and Goldwin Smith differed in most of their views, but they agreed in recommending a unified administration of College property. "Why," asks the former in words already quoted, "should not the Colleges be relieved of the burden of management of their property, and throw their accounts into the same office, with proper provision for superintendence, in which the University business is to be conducted?" and Goldwin Smith (also before quoted) says: "The time of persons devoted to education ought not to be spent in the management of estates. . . It would, in truth, be a good thing for the Colleges if their property were in the funds."

This last assertion that the Colleges ought to sell their lands and invest the proceeds in trustee securities is sure to be contested, but it is worth examination as clearing the way for a centralised administration. The *Quarterly Review*, in the article mentioned above, says: "The Colleges are great land-owners, and have the outgoings of land-owners. Though the expenses of the estate management are only about 7 per cent. of the revenues arising from the estates, yet £130,000 a year are spent on management, repairs and improvements on the estates, rates and taxes, interest on loans, and the maintenance of the costly College buildings in Cambridge." The question inevitably arises, Ought the Colleges to be great land-owners? Are they fitted for the task? Land-owning is an expensive occupation, and those who follow it have to be content with a very low return. Just now many landlords are putting their estates on the market; they are tired of bearing the ancestral burdens of ownership, and are attracted by the higher rate of interest obtainable from other forms of investment and the reduction of their labours to the simple task of receiving periodical dividends. Would not the Colleges do well to follow their example?

The College farms are scattered over a wide area. The bulk of them are in Cambridgeshire and the neighbouring counties, but the Royal Commission Report of 1872 showed that at the date mentioned Clare owned landed estate in Yorkshire; Caius in Devonshire and Dorset; King's in Dorset, Wiltshire, Devonshire, and Lancashire;

St. Catharine's in Yorkshire; Christ's in Gloucestershire and Pembrokeshire; St. John's in Yorkshire; Magdalene in Anglesey, Carnarvonshire and Wiltshire; and Trinity in Yorkshire and Westmoreland. Land wants to be looked after by some one on the spot. All these estates cannot be properly administered from Cambridge, and they must be either more or less neglected, or put in the hands of agents, which is always a costly arrangement.

The reader may here be reminded of certain figures given in Chapter XI. It was there shown that the gross receipts of the University of Oxford and its Colleges were £318,000 in 1883, and £387,000 in 1911, an increase of £69,000; but the net receipts were respectively £206,000 and £226,000, an increase of only £20,000. The balance of £49,000 represented additional expenditure. Well may Mr. Price complain of the ever-increasing burden of rates, taxes, repairs and improvements; nor is there any prospect of a change for the better.

College sentiment, it must be again admitted, will be strongly against the change here advocated, a sentiment which Lord Curzon well voices.¹ "It is doubtful whether landlords more broad-minded or considerate than the Colleges could anywhere be found; and were the tenants allowed a voice in their own destiny, few would probably not resent a change. The relations between the Colleges and their estates have lasted in many cases for centuries, and have engendered a feeling of combined attachment and obligation which it would seem a pity to disturb. The Estates-Bursars, who manage the estates on behalf of the Colleges, have the stimulus of devotion to their College, instead of a merely professional connexion with the estates; and the visitation of the College Heads—many of whom are exceedingly conscientious in this respect—together with some of the Fellows, are warmly welcomed by the tenants."

There is an economic side to this idyllic picture. The writer of a special article on "Oxford College Estates"² puts it thus:—"As the agricultural properties of many of the Colleges are very scattered, it follows that their tenants are often left very much to themselves. This

¹ *Principles*, pp. 153-9.

² *The Times*, May 26th, 1913.

policy is not unpopular with the average farmer, who appreciates the absence of restrictions, and dislikes what he regards as excessive supervision. From the landlord's point of view, the policy is successful with a good tenant, but must be disastrous in the case of a bad one, and its fruits may sometimes be seen in neglected buildings and fences and badly farmed land. . . The rents of the farms are usually low, probably because it has been decided that, where constant supervision is difficult, it is more important to retain good and contented tenants than to secure an increase in the College revenues which might be only temporary." It would be interesting also to learn whether the labourers on the estates are all as contented with their cottages as the farmers are with their rents.

At Cambridge there is, I think, less sentiment than at Oxford, though the same kind of feeling undoubtedly exists. The economic facts are the same in both cases. They may be thus briefly summarised :—(1) Land-owning requires exceptional knowledge and skill, and is at best an expensive luxury ; (2) College lands are often let at less than their economic rent ; (3) they are widely scattered, and therefore of more than average difficulty to manage. Efficiency is a ruthless word, and it may seem cruel to do away with a very picturesque if out-of-date system ; but if the interests of national education demand it, it will have to be done.

House property stands in a different class. It is easier to look after, and, in certain cases, holds out hopes of an expanding revenue. Where this expectation can be justified, it may be kept ; otherwise it should be sold, especially if it is old, and repairs are an increasing item. Building leases would naturally be held till their expiration. In any case there should be administration in common for the sake of economy.

What is here suggested does not necessitate the pooling of the College revenues. A Central Board would collect the income, discharge the liabilities, and hand over to each College its own share, less its proportion of the cost of administration, and its contribution to the Common University Fund. There would be joint management and separate account keeping.

After the Bursars come the Stewards, in whose hands is the domestic management of the Colleges. In some of these institutions, according to tradition, it is the cook who is the richest man. Encouraged by this example of successful private enterprise, other Colleges have taken to running their own kitchens, not without profit, but combination would produce still better results. Between 3,500 and 4,000 men dine daily in Hall during Term. Many of them have other meals sent in from the kitchens. Here is a fine, steady business which might either be managed by a central body, or be let on contract under proper conditions in the open market. An enterprising management would improve on the present system and enable the undergraduates to live more cheaply and better at the same time. A like choice of courses is open with regard to the rest of the bodily wants of the inmates, and the worry about gyps, bed-makers, helps, waiters, coal-porters, boot-blacks, laundresses and all the rest of them would be taken away from men of learning, and be borne by people with a greater relish for business details.

There remains the maintenance of existing buildings and the erection of new ones. Why should not there be a University Board or a department of a University Board doing these things for the Colleges in common? In time such a Board might even attempt Fire Insurance.

There is another matter of great importance which falls to be mentioned here. Lord Curzon has the following remarks¹:—"Different standards of expenditure prevail in different Colleges, some spending more on buildings, upkeep and repairs, others on purely educational objects. One College spends from income, another uses the facilities offered by the Board of Agriculture to raise loans. I take the case of a single College which appears to illustrate these idiosyncrasies of practice in a marked degree:—

	1906	1907
	£	£
Income from Lands and Houses at rack rent ...	18,438	18,725
Repairs and Improvements	7,781	6,724
Payment to Common University Fund ...	275	233
Total contribution to University Purposes ...	2,775	2,733

¹ *Principles and Methods*, pp. 154, 155.

The figures of these years show that this College is in the habit of charging its estate repairs and improvements, even when they amount to so large a percentage of the estate receipts, to the income of the year. Other Colleges meet such expenditure, if called for, by a loan. (The College in question has, meanwhile, contracted loans since 1905 of £28,000; apparently in connexion with College buildings and a new residence for its Head.) The significance of these figures to the University is very great, because it is obvious that had the usual practice of raising loans for large external expenditure been followed, the payment to the Common University Fund would have been much larger. For the protection of University interests, and for the maintenance of some uniformity in administration, it might be desirable to enact by Statute that College expenditure on repairs and improvements, external and internal, should not exceed in any one year a fixed percentage of the net income." Lord Curzon then points out other anomalies and discrepancies, and draws the conclusion that "they are the inevitable consequences of a system in which there is no controlling authority beyond the Governing Bodies of the Colleges themselves, and in which the University, outside the pale of its statutory rights, is powerless to intervene. . . . At the present moment there is no force beyond public opinion—a not too certain check—to prevent a rich College from spending a disproportionate amount of its income upon buildings. These may or may not be necessary. Probably, in the great majority of instances they are. But when it is remembered that in either case the University is penalized, in proportion to the outlay, it does not seem unreasonable that an independent scrutiny and a higher sanction should be required. Is it not probable, indeed, that both University and Colleges would be the gainers if some greater degree of uniformity could be introduced, and if certain broad guiding principles were laid down, to which, with reasonable latitude, all parties should be asked to conform?"¹

The writer recurs to the same point at p. 160, under

¹ *Ib.* p. 157.

the heading "The Management of College Estates." After pointing out various drawbacks to the present system, he continues: "Above all, there is no individual and no body to regulate, co-ordinate or control. Thus we may have, as has been shown, one College restricting its expenditure on repairs and improvements, and another College indulging in undue liberality; different standards and scales of outlay exist side by side. It may be said that the same is true of private properties. But the answer is that the College estates are not private properties; they are held in trust for the nation, and for an object in which every man and woman in the nation is entitled to feel and to express a concern. It is therefore reasonable that a special measure of vigilance should be applied in their case; and that the University, no less than the public, should have some guarantee that these large emoluments are being administered not only with propriety and without extravagance, but with a strict regard to the general object for which they were given, and with a due correlation to each other."

The justice of these remarks cannot be questioned, but the proposals are not as new as might be imagined. Section 21 (3) of the Act of 1877 lays it down that "the Commissioners, in Statutes made by them, may from time to time, if they think fit, make provision:—

"(3) For regulating the exercise of the borrowing powers of the University or of a College." So far as I know, the Commissioners never exercised this power, but it was clearly in the mind of Parliament that they should. There will have to be statutory regulations of the character indicated, and one of them must be that the consent of the University will have to be obtained, before a College is allowed to raise money on loan. If this restriction is deemed unworthy and not to be borne, it should be remembered that every municipal body from the humblest Parish Council to the great municipal corporations like Liverpool, Birmingham and Manchester, or the London County Council, cannot borrow a single penny without the leave of the Local Government Board. They must all submit their proposals and justify the expenditure. They do so without suffering any sense of indignity.

Another necessary reform is the public auditing of

all University and College accounts in place of the private auditing now practised.

One objection may be urged against certain of the above suggestions, quite apart from any question of College dignity and independence. It is that there is a risk in what may be called Stock Exchange investments owing to the gradual fall in the value of money. There is force in this contention, and the danger may be guarded against in two ways. The Colleges should be allowed to write off whenever necessary a certain percentage each year for depreciation of their securities, and both the University and the Colleges ought annually to put a certain sum to reserve, so as not only to keep their property intact, but also to increase it with a view to meeting future educational developments.

To turn to the question of the necessary machinery. In the scheme mentioned in the Preface it was suggested that the Financial Board should undertake the work, but it might be better to set up an entirely new body. The Financial Board stands to the University somewhat as the Treasury does to the Government, and its Chairman is the nearest approach we have to a Chancellor of the Exchequer. The fresh functions to be discharged resemble rather those discharged by Somerset House and the Board of Works, which are separate Government offices. There might be a University Board of Management and Works, organised in two departments, the one for the management of College property and finance as a whole, and the other for such matters as repairs, buildings, commissariat, etc. Its Chairman would be an *ex officio* member of the Council of the Senate.

If the system outlined above was worked loyally and efficiently, a saving would certainly result. How large it would be, it is impossible accurately to estimate, but it forms one of a number of possible savings which may fairly be expected to set the University free from its present financial embarrassments.

The administrative work of the Colleges having been dealt with, their educational or teaching work falls next to be considered. Here again College susceptibilities are certain to be aroused by any scheme of central supervision and control, but there are some considerations which

should prevent calmness of judgment being unduly interfered with. Recent years have presented no more pleasing sight than the gradual growth of Inter-Collegiate teaching. Experience has proved that instruction thus given outside College does not in any way tend to the breaking down of the Collegiate system. Attendance at University and Inter-Collegiate lectures does not impair loyalty and affection to a man's own College. It would be possible, I imagine, to find a considerable body of undergraduates, Science men for the most part, who receive no instruction whatever within their own Colleges, and yet they are just as devoted to them as those who may never go outside for a single lecture. It ought to be possible then to consider a great extension of co-operative teaching without undue apprehension of possible disaster to the Collegiate system.

Two classes of men have to be taught—the Poll men, and the Honours men.

The Poll men are, practically speaking, wholly taught by the Colleges,¹ and their position will be considered later on.

The teaching of the Honours men is divided between the University and the Colleges. There are no data available to show exactly what proportion of the work is done by each, but there are certain accessible facts which bear on the point. In the List of Lectures for 1912-13, issued by the authority of the General Board of Studies, a University body, instruction is offered under 21 heads—Agricultural Studies, Anthropology, Architectural Studies, Biology and Geology, Classics, Divinity, Economics and Politics, Foreign Service Students, Geographical Studies, History and Archæology, Indian Civil Service, Law, Mathematics, Medicine, Mediæval and Modern Languages, Military Subjects, Moral Science, Music, Oriental Studies, Physics and Chemistry, and the Teachers' Training Syndicate. These subjects may be classified in three divisions, (i) those in which the teaching is wholly or predominantly University; (ii) those in which the teaching is wholly or predominantly Collegiate; and (iii) those in which the teaching is divided in varying proportions

¹ A few Lectures in Science are provided for them by the University.

between the University and the Colleges. This grouping works out as follows:—

(1) *University predominant.*

Agriculture, Anthropology, Architecture, Biology and Geology, Foreign Service, Geography, Indian Civil Service, Medicine, Military Subjects, Physics (which includes Engineering) and Chemistry, Training of Teachers (11).

(2) *Colleges predominant.*

Classics, Divinity, Economics and Politics, History and Archæology, Law, Mathematics, Music (7).

(3) *Divided.*

Mediæval and Modern Languages, Moral Sciences, Oriental Studies (3).

Even if this classification is criticised in detail, the deduction from it is plain and unassailable. To repeat what has already been pointed out, since 1850 the University has been doing more and more of the teaching. Science and practical subjects are turning the scale in its favour. This change has not weakened the Colleges. On the contrary, taken collectively, they are more flourishing than ever, and the Collegiate feeling is as strong as ever. What fault then, if any, can be found with the above mixed system of instruction? Where it is worked by the University, little or none. It is unified and organised, and its defects are due to financial, not educational, causes. Where the Colleges give the instruction there are the beginnings of better things, but not the full fruition. The Inter-Collegiate system is an immense advance on the old state of things, when every College, large or small, lectured to its own students and to no others. There is co-operation, but only to a limited extent. What has been done, roughly speaking, is for each College to arrange its own lectures, and then to throw them open to members of other Colleges. There are periodical conferences of Lecturers; but these conferences seem, in Lord Curzon's words, "to register rather than revise." There is at present no adequate and complete scheme of teaching.

To justify this contention, let us attempt an analysis of one of the Lists of Lectures proposed by the General Board of Studies,—the Classical Lectures for the Lent

Term of the current year 1913.¹ The Classical Tripos consists of two parts. In Part I. papers are set containing passages for translation from the best Greek and Latin authors, passages for translation into Greek and Latin Prose, and Greek and Latin Verse, and papers in Greek and Roman History and Antiquities, Philology and Syntax, Greek and Roman Philosophy, Greek and Latin Literature, Sculpture and Architecture. It will be sufficient if we confine our attention to Part I. alone. The best Greek and Latin authors may fairly be held to comprise Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Aristotle, the Attic Orators, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus, Hesiod, Homer, Pindar, Plato, Sophocles, Theocritus, and Thucydides for Greek; and Catullus, Cicero, Juvenal, Livy, Lucretius, Martial, Persius, Plautus, Pliny, Propertius, Suetonius, Tacitus and Tibullus for Latin; to say nothing of Xenophon, Horace and Virgil, which may be omitted as school authors. Thirty-one sets of lectures appear in the list,² of which five are given by the University. As was stated above, the practice at Cambridge is not to give any set books for translation; passages are selected at the Examiners' pleasure from the best Greek and Latin authors. Translating unseen passages at sight is therefore a very important part of the training, and a student is practised in it from school onwards. The University as such makes no provision for such training, nor does the Inter-Collegiate system of lectures. The same holds good of Composition. It will seem strange to an outsider that the University should not afford complete instruction in two most important subjects in which it holds an examination, and that it has never occurred to the Colleges to co-operate and fill the gap, but so it is. The work in question is done by the Colleges individually; and here is part of the explanation why the larger and richer Colleges win so many more first classes than the smaller and poorer. They can afford to pay for specialists in each department of instruction, and the other Colleges cannot.

¹ *Cambridge University Reporter*, January 11, 1913, pp. 508, 509.

² The two sets given at Selwyn are not included, as Selwyn is not a College in the sense in which the other 17 Colleges are.

Of the courses of lectures on the chief Classical authors the University give one—on Lucretius; the Inter-Collegiate Lecturers give 11, on Aristotle, *Ethics*, Plato, *Republic II.-IV.*, Plautus, Suetonius, Cicero, *ad Atticum*, Aristophanes, *Nubes*, *Aves*, *Thesmophoriazusa*, Cicero, *pro Flacco* and *Verrine Orations*. Our list above contained the names of 27 authors. The Lecture List contains the names of 6, the balance of 21 being totally unprovided for. Of the 11 courses, three are on the same three books of Plato's *Republic*, and two on the same two comedies of Aristophanes, *Nubes* and *Aves*. Roman History gets five sets of lectures, Greek History only one; one course is divided between the two. What would a German University say to such a scheme? It is in the embryonic stage, excellent as embodying the principle of co-operation, but needing to be carried very much further before it is even in sight of completion.

The Report of the Committee on the Constitution and Government of the University before alluded to, has the following remarks on this point¹:—

“While in the different departments of Science and in certain other subjects the formal teaching is provided almost entirely by the University, in many subjects the greater part of the teaching is done by the staffs of the different Colleges in formal lectures (which are almost all open to all members of the University), class work, or individual instruction.

“In these subjects, in so far as the needs of the different studies are not met by Professors, Readers and University Lecturers, the Committee believe that more effective co-operation in the distribution of lectures between College Lecturers might be attained without interfering with the proper freedom of the Colleges in arranging their own teaching. They realise that, in some studies, it is necessary and desirable that more than one lecture on the same subject or the same branch of the subject should be given; and that in some cases there is a manifest advantage in the lectures being addressed to an audience limited in number with whose needs the Lecturer is familiar. With this qualification, the lectures

¹ pp. 12, 13.

given by College Lecturers might be rendered more generally useful, both by the more effective revision of the lecture lists by the Special Boards, and by the voluntary association of Colleges for lecturing purposes.

"Some combinations of Colleges are already at work; and the Committee think that the principle might be extended and that much good might result from such association. The further development of the principle must be voluntary and in some degree experimental, but the Committee think it may be useful to record some of the results of such combinations as have been effected, though it is not in their power to make definite proposals.

"In one instance the combination of three Colleges (originally the outcome of an informal arrangement made by the Tutors of two of them) has been extended to lectures in all subjects, which are open without fee to students of all the three Colleges. The lectures are arranged in consultation, the dates at which they should begin and end and the dates of the Annual Examinations (which are held in common) are jointly fixed. The combination, being more or less informal, has no definite rules: it is managed on a basis of give and take: it has been gradually developed, without friction, during thirty-five years; and it seems to be accepted by all concerned as normal.

"Another combination of Colleges has been practically limited to lectures in Mathematics, Classics and Theology. Here also common Examinations are held.

"A third group of Colleges has for many years been associated for lectures in Mathematics, and this group has recently been enlarged and certain parts of the Mechanical Sciences course have been included in its scope.

"In these groups the provision of lectures open to all the Colleges in the group is supplemented by class work or work with individuals, in each College, generally confined to the members thereof.

"Another combination, restricted to Theology, has more recently been formed.

"It is obvious that co-operation of Colleges for this purpose leads to efficiency and economy in lectures. Fewer formal lectures are needed, and thus the burden

of each Lecturer is lessened. And, further, students have the advantage of hearing a greater variety of lectures. The combination of Colleges has largely reduced the number of separate examinations, and this practice might be still further extended with advantage.

"The combination between Colleges might be still more effective if Colleges, thus connected, consulted each other informally in making an election to a Fellowship or a Lectureship, when the needs of the different studies in the group might be considered.

"The co-operation of the Colleges might usefully be extended to the direction of studies and class work in subjects such as History, Modern Languages, Law and Economics, in which each College has not usually a full staff of Lecturers.

"It has been suggested, as a further mode of combination, that in some subjects, in which teaching is provided in unequal degrees by different Colleges, the Colleges might contribute (in proportion to the number of their students in the subject, or otherwise) to a joint fund from which Lecturers should be paid."

As for University teaching, the Committee think that the initiative for the provision of further University teaching must come either from the General Board of Studies or from the Special Boards of Studies,¹ and that it is desirable that the constitution of the Special Boards should be reformed so as to make them more fully representative of the teachers.²

All these suggestions are sound and good as far as they go; what they lack is courage. There is too much fear of interfering with what is called "the proper freedom of the Colleges in arranging their own teaching," which leads the Committee to say that "it is not in their power to make definite proposals." Is the teaching the private property of the Colleges? Are they not, by the law of the land, national institutions, and bound to look upon themselves in that light? Is not Lord Curzon right when he describes them as trustees, and that for an object in which every man and woman in the nation is entitled to feel and express a concern?

¹ *Ib.* p. 10.

² *Ib.* p. 11.

The way of salvation lies along the path tentatively marked out in the above extracts. The University must come in as the unifying and coordinating authority in all the Honour teaching, given either by itself or by the Colleges. The machinery lies ready to hand in the General Board of Studies and the Special Boards of Studies; it only requires to be adapted to present-day needs. The Report of the Council of the Senate on the Constitution and Government of the University says¹:—

“A considerable change is proposed in the constitution of the General Board of Studies. In the opinion of the Council, the General Board is at present too large. A reduction in size is impossible if the attempt is made to maintain the separate representation of all the bodies now represented upon it. The proposal which is now made is intended to provide a Board of reasonable size, while maintaining generally a representative character.

“These proposals are embodied in the following scheme:—

“That the General Board of Studies shall consist of the Vice-Chancellor and sixteen members of the Senate, to be elected on the nomination of the Council of the Senate. Four shall be nominated in each year. Not fewer than four members of the Board shall be Professors. The Council shall, in making the nominations, have regard to the representation of studies.”

As for the Special Boards of Studies, attention may be drawn in this connexion to the Report of the Committee before referred to²: “The Committee think that under the considerable powers already possessed by the Special Boards and the General Board, steps might be taken to make the organisation of Lectures more effective. . . . The Committee are of opinion that it is desirable :

(1) That the constitution of the Special Boards of Studies should be reformed so as to make them more fully representative of the teachers.

(2) That the list of Lectures for the ensuing academic year should be considered by the Special Boards in the Lent Term of each year, and should be sent to the

¹ *University Reporter*, March 1, 1910, pp. 680-681.

² *Report*, p. 11.

General Board of Studies before the end of the Lent Term, in order that the General Board may have proper time in the Easter Term to consider the lists and to approve them or remit them for further consideration with alterations and amendments.

(3) That in the preparation of the Lecture lists due regard should be paid to the grading of Lectures for students of different ability and attainments.

(4) That Lectures proposed by the Special Boards should be arranged to begin on or about the same date; that this date should be as near as possible to the beginning of Full Term; and that the Colleges should be asked to make common arrangements for the commencement of residence."

These last words deserve a brief comment. As the University has no control over who are to be its students, so it has no control over the precise date in each term at which they shall begin their studies. Each College fixes for itself the day on which its undergraduates shall "come up." The above extract shows that they do not all light on the same day. There are thus different times for the beginning of residence and also for the beginning of lectures. Hence a certain amount of confusion and loss of time. The authors of the Report suggest that "the Colleges should be asked to make common arrangements"; that the University should be master in its own house and settle the dates for coming into residence and beginning work has obviously not occurred to them.

Let us then suppose that the alterations suggested above have been carried out, that the Boards have been made the proper size, and satisfactorily representative in character. Something more will remain to be done. The General Board of Studies excited great hopes when it was first instituted, but it has proved a disappointment. It has not organised the teaching work of the University as was expected. The reason is not far to seek. The Report from which we have quoted considers the "Teaching for Honours-Examinations" under two heads—(I.) Lectures proposed by the Special Boards of Studies; and (II.) College Lectures. They say: "The lists of lectures proposed by the Special Boards include lectures by Professors, Readers and University Lecturers, and lectures

by College Lecturers and others.”¹ This is quite accurate, but the significance of it may be lost on the outsider. The instruction here alluded to is only part of what is given. The rest comes under (II.) College Lectures; and here, as has before been pointed out, the Report insists on “the proper freedom of the Colleges in arranging their own teaching.”² This is the rock on which the General Board of Studies has split. There is a large area outside its jurisdiction, and until it is made supreme over the whole field of instruction the old evils will not be removed. The Board must be given control over both University and College teaching. It must be able to make “regulations and instructions in respect to the subjects and character of the lectures to be delivered” not only by the University but by the Colleges.

Two of the three kinds of work performed by a College have now been examined—the Administrative and the Educational. There remains the third kind,—the Tutorial. This must remain untouched. The task of supervising the studies and morals of the undergraduates can be far better discharged locally than by a centralised body. The Colleges need fear no attack at this point. They will always retain their Tutorial functions, so far as one can see, and nothing can deprive them of their corporate life, save the forcible closing of their doors. Let us then return with minds made easier to the consideration of the work of teaching.

There are difficulties still to be overcome. The Colleges with their widely varying resources in the shape of men to teach and money to pay them, and with their fluctuating numbers, might find grave, if not insuperable obstacles in the way of their joining and playing an effective part in such a scheme as has been sketched above. The fluctuation in numbers is especially serious. For instance, a College which had “for centuries humbly reposed at, or close to, the bottom in point of size,” could not “almost at a bound rise to the head of the second rank” without greatly disturbing, if not altogether upsetting, a centralised scheme of teaching. Some plan must be found of equalising resources, and preventing or

¹ p. 11.

² p. 12.

minimising fluctuations. Nothing seems to meet the case but a closer combination of the Colleges; but this is such dangerous ground that it will be the height of rashness to tread on it without some backing of authority. That backing will be found to be much stronger than most people are aware.

The first witness to be called is Sir William Hamilton,¹ who held that "In the smaller Colleges it might be advantageous, if two at least combined, and had in common a single complement of Tutors." Some of the evidence given at Cambridge before the Royal Commission of 1850, points the same way. The Rev. J. W. Blakesley said:² "I believe that the same degree of efficiency as at Trinity might be secured in the smaller Colleges by a confederation of three or four for the purposes of Tuition. An arrangement might be made between the Tutors of these for a classification of their pupils, and for securing the advantage of the division of labour in lecturing. I do not see the impossibility of extending the union still further, to the free election of Scholars and Fellows indifferently from among the students of the Colleges so united. And I am disposed to think that such a confederation, if the terms of union were framed on a liberal basis, and the arrangement carried out in a generous spirit by the individuals who were parties to it, would in some respects secure the advantages now possessed by the large Colleges, and escape the drawbacks. For instance, a union of four Colleges, which in the aggregate mustered as large a number of students as Trinity, would be able to secure equally efficient lectures, and at the same time would supply a much better accommodation in Hall and Chapel, and be free from the evils attendant on an accumulation of very great numbers within the same walls."

Dean Merivale gave evidence to the like effect:—"With our existing distinction of large and small Colleges, it seems impossible for the smaller to give uniformly and permanently the same security for efficient tuition which may perhaps be afforded by the larger. . . . An arrangement by which three or four small Colleges

¹ *Discussions*, p. 805.

² *Evidence*, p. 150.

could be united for the purposes of tuition, by opening their emoluments one to the other, and extending the circle from which elections to Scholarships and Fellowships could be made, would be of immense importance, as it would allow of a fair competition between the Colleges which does not now exist."

It is only right to add that the Commissioners themselves rejected this solution in the following passage¹:—"To meet such difficulties it has been proposed to group several such Societies (*i.e.* small Colleges) into a confederation for the purpose of giving their instruction in common. But we are inclined to think there would be found in practice objections almost insuperable to such a mode of proceeding, and at best it would require a combination of so many conditions to be satisfied, that we cannot be induced to rely upon it with any confidence of success."

Mark Pattison, greatly daring, proposed to amalgamate Merton with Corpus Christi College, and to dedicate the united College to the study of Biology, Chemistry, and the allied branches.² Goldwin Smith's opinion has already been quoted in Chapter VIII. "It seems to be generally acknowledged that the system under which each College attempts to be a University in itself must be abandoned, and that the Colleges must combine among themselves and with the University Professoriate for the purposes of instruction." Lord Curzon brings forward the same idea in a different connexion. "It has been suggested that two or three Colleges might be thrown into one, with the result of a considerable saving in respect of College officers and servants."³ The President of Magdalen College, Oxford, in his address as Vice-Chancellor, in 1907, made special mention of this last suggestion as effecting economies by the fusion of two or more Colleges.

The Cambridge Memorandum appended to the Royal Commission Report of 1874 has already been quoted. It says: "Provision could be made for the association of the Colleges, or some of them, for educational purposes, so as to secure more efficient teaching and to allow to the teachers more leisure for private study."

¹ Report, p. 79.

² Suggestions, p. 157.

³ Principles and Methods, p. 70.

But the strongest authority which can be adduced for the proposal is the legislation which followed the Report. Clause 22 of the Act of 1877, which has been already set out,¹ enacted that the Commissioners in statutes made by them might provide for "the union of Colleges and Halls and institutions, or combination for education," as the marginal note reads. Parliament did not set up this machinery for the fun of the thing; it intended that it should be taken advantage of. At least it put on record a principle. Has not the time come when this principle should be seriously considered?

What may be called the Act-of-1877-policy might be worked out and completed as follows, the Colleges being divided into six groups, Trinity counting as a group by itself:—

College.	Undergraduates on books.	Gross corporate income.	Assessable income.
		£	£
1. Trinity	672	76,492	55,393
2. Trinity Hall	146	8,828	8,138
Clare	201	16,558	12,924
Caius	327	29,639	24,930
3. King's	166	37,654	25,640
Queens'	181	8,686	7,843
St. Cath.'s	129	6,063	5,719
Corpus	85	12,325	10,810
4. Pembroke	293	13,896	13,542
Peterhouse	81	8,212	6,758
Downing	116	9,988	7,132
5. Emmanuel	192	19,885	17,735
Christ's	227	14,943	12,133
Sidney	112	14,952	10,858
6. St. John's	244	42,945	33,344
Jesus	212	13,505	12,968
Magdalene	115	6,931	6,109

The principle here adopted is the necessary one of propinquity. The result is six groups of fairly equal size and resources, the weak spot being No. 4—Pembroke, Peterhouse and Downing. If any further approximation to equality was desired, it might be attained by graduating

¹ See above, p. 224. It is worthy of note that the Executive Commission under the Act of 1877 had many powers which have never found their way into operation. Those relating to the regulation of borrowing by a College, the renewal of beneficial leases, and the union of Colleges have already been mentioned. The power to found University Scholarships for poor men, and to transfer a College Library or a portion thereof will be referred to later on.

the payments to the Common University Fund, as is done at Oxford. On the figures given above all the groups might be taxed at the same rate up to £27,500, and then a super-tax might be levied on each £1,000 of assessable income over and above that minimum. An extra endowment of £250,000, divided between Peterhouse and Downing, would also be a great help. The principle of emulation cannot be dispensed with while the state of public opinion with regard to education remains as it is; but these groups could compete on something like a fair footing, and not in the hopelessly unequal fashion that the separate Colleges do now. Fluctuations in numbers would also be stopped, or at least rendered less severe, for a group of three or four Colleges would be much more stable than the single unit. If one member of the group went down, the chances are that one of the others would go up. It would thus become possible for the University to organise and coordinate all the teaching given within its borders. Its instrument, the General Board of Studies, might not shrink from driving six well-matched horses together, though it might well hesitate before attempting the same task with seventeen steeds of such varying size, strength and pace.

The necessity of organising the teaching may also be pressed from the purely University point of view. For the last sixty years the cry has been for more Professorships, Readerships, and Lectureships, and there has been a great increase in the number of these posts during that time. But good as all this increase in teaching power may have been, it is of paramount importance to fit the newcomers into a properly organised and coordinated scheme, otherwise their work may be wasted. It is doubtful whether all these fresh appointments have justified expectations. If they have not, it is the system which is mainly to blame.

But this is not the whole of the matter. Instruction at Cambridge cannot be considered fully organised unless a succession of the best teachers has been secured. To this end it is necessary, (1) to give the intending teachers suitable training, and (2) to open a career before them. This latter implies three things: (*a*) sufficient pay from

the beginning; (b) a reasonable prospect of promotion; and (c) a pension when work is done. Sad to say, all these three are yet lacking.

For elementary education—the simplest form of teaching—it is recognised that training is necessary, and the machinery for giving it is highly elaborated and effective. The power of imparting instruction in a Secondary School or in a University is supposed to be a spontaneous gift of nature. Teachers in these higher walks are born, not made; and to train them is regarded as a waste of time. How many teachers are there in the University of Cambridge who have been specially prepared for their work? Some few Secondary School teachers are receiving training; and if they ever recruit the ranks of the University teachers, the University will indirectly get a trained staff, but not otherwise. One can here only note the facts, as suggestions for supplying the training are outside the purpose of these pages.¹

A very frequent complaint of the University reformers from the first has been that teaching at Oxford and Cambridge is not a career. The professions, the Civil Service, the world of business, all present greater attractions, and offer richer prizes; the result being that the majority of the enterprising men will not stay on at the Universities. This is, of course, quite true, and must always be so. A teacher at Cambridge can never make as much money as a successful barrister, or physician, or merchant prince, but his prospects might be made much better than they are. At present the plan followed by the Colleges, and to a lesser extent by the University, is to take a young man of 22 or 23 who has gained a high place in a Tripos, and put him straight away to teaching without any previous training. A College gives this young man a Lectureship, and because a Lectureship is poorly paid, it adds thereto a Fellowship, which is to be retained so long as the duty of teaching is discharged. This method of procedure cannot be deemed ideal, either for the College or for the individual himself. The appointment is at best an experiment, and may turn

¹ The training of Secondary Teachers is touched on in various places in the *Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education*, 1895. See pp. 70, 71, 80, 198-209, 321-323.

out well or ill. Some such experiments turn out ill. A certain number of the men who are thus appointed never acquire the art of imparting the knowledge which they possess, they are dull and uninspiring, and they remain a perplexity to the College, a stumbling-block in the way of the students, and ill at ease with themselves. There is another way in which this system is bad for individuals. It gives them too much to begin with, and it offers them no further prospects. A Lecture-ship plus a Fellowship may not be intrinsically of high pecuniary value, but it seems so to a young man who comes fresh from an examination, and who has never earned anything before. After a time the teacher takes stock of the situation. He finds that the College has done all for him that he can expect it to do for many years to come. The Master bids fair to be another proof of the longevity which is associated with that office in the public mind, the Senior Tutor will in his turn be made Master, and there are other men who by virtue of their standing have a prior claim on any Tutorship which may fall vacant. Ambition is thus quenched, and an acquiescence in the inevitable takes its place. The more alert and active of the young graduates look down upon the life of the average Don; and, attractive as teaching may be to them, they see the Capuan dangers of Cambridge, and betake themselves to careers where they have greater scope.

These disadvantages may be minimised, even if they cannot be altogether avoided. Proper training being conceded, the question of adequate payment next arises. The financial difficulty is always with us, and here it meets us in the shape of the Fellowship system. The Oxford Accounts for 1907 show a sum of £61,550 19s. 10d. paid to Fellows. The *Quarterly Reviewer* of 1906 reckoned the corresponding Cambridge figure at £63,000. The exact amounts do not matter for the present argument; it is enough to know that they are large, and are not directly paid for teaching. The whole question of the Fellowships thus comes up for consideration.

Few institutions have undergone more frequent and striking changes than Fellowships. Originally allowances on the most meagre scale, with laborious courses of study

attached to them, payable only to members of a particular church, and that on condition of poverty, celibacy, and residence; they have become comfortable sinecures, with no duties attached, tenable by any academically qualified person possessed of any amount of money, who may marry and reside where he pleases. Mark Pattison thus describes the course of these changes¹: "The old Statutes imposed very strict conditions of tenure. For they had, in almost every instance, required the Fellows to proceed to the superior degree in one of the Faculties. Failure to do so was to forfeit the Fellowship, *ipso facto*. The effect of this requirement, under the old University system, was to impose upon the Fellow, as the condition of his tenure, a prolonged course of study of from twenty to twenty-five years, in a special branch of knowledge—study not merely private and uncertificated, but evidenced by a regular appearance in the public schools for disputation, and by the performance of other public exercises. These exercises had been long disused by the University, and dispensed with for the degrees. The College Fellow was unable to perform the public disputations and was content to take the degree. In many of the larger foundations the College Statutes had not merely imposed the Faculty Degree, with its necessary course of study, but had superadded private courses of study for the Fellows, with extra disputations and exercises, as tests of proficiency to be given within the College walls. These had fallen into desuetude along with the public exercises. For the public University and private Collegiate appearances and exercises no substitute had been provided. These exercises and disputations were, however, only the outward tokens; the tests, occasions, and evidence of study, or continued pursuit of acquirement; they were not that study itself. Though the opportunity of publicly proving his proficiency was taken away from him, the Fellow still remained under the same obligation to the study which had constituted the whole purpose of his foundation.

"This was the statutable state of things when the Act of 1854 and the Commission intervened. . . . The Ordinances which emanated from it in every instance abolish

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 88-90; cf. pp. 124-127 for further details. For the method of awarding these prizes at Oxford see pp. 94-98.

the statutable regulations of studies and exercises, as well as the obligation to proceed to the superior degree. In no case do they attempt to substitute an equivalent. But though no duties are provided for him to perform, the Fellow is maintained in the enjoyment of his stipend and emoluments. In other words, the Ordinances of the Commission of 1854 converted the Fellowships into sinecures. The Commissioners found an enormous abuse subsisting illegally and they legalised it. . . . They took the title-deeds, erased the original national and noble purpose, and returned the parchments smilingly to their owners. Was it ignorance of University history, or want of sympathy with science and learning, or timidity?"

The Cambridge Commissioners of 1850 had no doubt of their own view. They say :¹ "The Fellowships cannot but be regarded as the chief source of life and vigour to the whole academical system. However valuable may be the various honours which the University bestows on the successful candidates for its numerous prizes, and however stimulating the competition for honourable places in the different Triposes, it is, after all, the College Fellowship which must be regarded as the chief motive to exertion, and the great reward of successful industry and talent." In other words, they believed in the principle of emulation, and they found it in the Prize Fellowship system.

Experience, however, proved that Prize Fellowships involved serious disadvantages. The growth of the Universities, and the extended range of studies, created a demand for more teaching, and the absentee Prize Fellow was not there to give it. Hence came two movements—the first to cut down the length of tenure, and the second to attach definite College work to the office, thus getting rid altogether of the pure Prize Fellowship. As for the first movement,² the latest suggestion is that the tenure should undergo yet another shortening, and "that in general a Fellow should in the first instance be elected for a term of three years, and should be eligible for re-election for a further term of three years." But with every reduction in the number of years, Prize Fellowships

¹ *Report*, p. 156.

² *Reform Committee's Report*, p. 15.

become less valuable, or, in other words, less attractive, and to regard them as the chief driving force of the University is no longer possible, nor in fact are they so regarded. Some other means must be found of keeping alive the spirit of emulation.

As for the second movement, the *Quarterly Reviewer*¹ says that in 1904 there were at Cambridge about 315 ordinary Fellows. Of these, "some 245 were Resident, and some 70 Non-resident. Of the Residents, about 225 were holding some University or College office, educational or administrative. Of the Non-residents, and of the Residents who were holding no office, the greater number had earned their Fellowships by holding some qualifying position, such as a Lectureship, for a given number of years, usually 20. Among the Non-residents, in addition to Fellows who hold their Fellowships as a pension, were to be found students prosecuting Research away from Cambridge; such students are, as a rule, liable to be summoned to reside, as College exigencies may demand. Several other Non-residents are Fellows who have but recently received appointments away from Cambridge; their Fellowships will, under the new Statutes, lapse in a year or two. The analysis shows that the number of 'Prize Fellowships' is small, and it is believed that they are steadily diminishing."

The Reform Committee² confirm this view. They say: "The introduction and development of teaching in old and new subjects has rapidly increased the demand for Fellowships for the support of new teaching and for the encouragement of Research. In consequence, the number of Fellowships held irrespective of conditions of service or Research, has been largely diminished. Some Colleges have, in practice, abolished Prize Fellowships by making it a rule to attach conditions to the tenure of Fellowships. The Committee think it very important that this principle should be generally adopted." *Exit* the Prize Fellow.

The reader will gather from these extracts that Fellowships are given in four ways: (1) as Prizes; (2) as part payment for teaching or other College work;

¹ p. 512.

² p. 15.

(3) as Pensions; (4) for Research. Let us examine these one by one.

1. It may be taken for granted that Prize Fellowships are doomed. They are bad for the Colleges because they absorb a portion of its revenues without yielding any return in the shape of work done. For the men who receive them they are at once too large and too small. A Fellowship of £200 a year for six or seven years is obviously excessive, and out of all proportion, as a mere prize. On the other hand, it is too small in amount, and too short in point of time, to constitute a career. Yet it not unfrequently deceives the recipient in these respects. Seven years seems a long way ahead to a young man, and £200 a year, with nothing to do for it, a comparatively large income. The result is that no inconsiderable number of Prize Fellows drift along for some of the most important years of life, then their Fellowships run out, and they find they have been handicapped rather than helped as far as a career goes. Actual experience thus weakens the force of the once popular argument in favour of the Prize Fellowship,—that it helps a man to a career by bridging over an inevitable waiting time. It has been shown that it may have the reverse effect. Again, it is not the duty of the Colleges to help men to a career. Their primary duty, as the component parts of the University, is to teach; and until they not only teach well, but pay their teachers adequately, they ought not to give Fellowships on so vague a ground as helping a man to a career. Fellowships, in fact, never are given for this reason. They are given for a high place in the Tripos; that they help a man to a position outside the University is an accident.

If, however, it is felt that there is still some force left in the old argument, and that it is good that men should be helped after they have finished their course of study, let the thing be done systematically and according to clearly defined principles. The University should be the responsible body, and the Career Scholarship, as it might be called, should last only so long as it is actually needed, and should be moderate in amount.

There are two special cases in which such Career Scholarships might be given with advantage to the community, and these are the Scholastic Profession and

Medicine. It is futile to preach the necessity of training for the teaching profession to those who have already difficulty in meeting the expenses of the normal three years' course. If a fourth year is to be added, the extra cost should be provided. Then, again, a medical course is long and expensive; and it is of the highest importance to the State, especially in view of recent legislation, that there should be a full supply of properly qualified doctors. These Scholarships could be given by the University on the result of its own examinations. They are, however, a counsel of perfection, as there are many more pressing claims.

2. Fellowships as part payment for College work.

Fellowships, as has been already seen, are now mostly attached to other College offices. A man serves as Lecturer, Tutor, Bursar, Steward, &c.; and the pay of these posts being generally insufficient to live on, a Fellowship is attached to them so that the holder of the two offices may eke out a subsistence. This is a strange plan, if it is critically examined. Good work is badly paid; and to make the balance even, a further payment is made for doing nothing at all. Sweated labour is compensated by a sinecure. Two ills are supposed to make one good. Surely the common-sense plan of the world outside is better—to pay well for work done, and to pay nothing except for work done.

3. Fellowships as pensions.

As stated above, if a Fellow has served his College faithfully for a number of years, he is allowed to retire from work and retain his Fellowship. A Fellowship thus becomes a pension, but in an unscientific and unbusiness-like shape. A pension ought to be graded in amount according to length of service and previous salary; and it ought to be paid as a pension, and not as something else. Pension schemes, both for the University and the Colleges, are of the greatest importance, but they must be set up and administered on business lines. The mere continuing of a Fellowship does not fulfil the proper conditions.

4. Fellowships for Research.

The whole question of Research is one of great difficulty and complexity, and more will be said about it later on. The University and certain of the Colleges are trying

to promote it, but it is often in such a way as to render Research an exceedingly perilous task for those who engage in it. A man takes his degree, and on the strength of it, or of some particular piece of work he wishes to do, his College gives him a Fellowship. He applies himself to his task, and at the end of it may be two, three, or, in very exceptional cases, ten years, his Fellowship expires and he is left without resources. A career as teacher has been made more difficult for him, because teaching institutions prefer men who have had experience, and he is by this time too old for the Civil Service both at home and abroad. No one should take a Research Fellowship unless he has private means whereon to live when the Fellowship has run out. The Fellowship system can therefore hardly be called ideal for the promotion of Research.

The Oxford plan, of a separate and additional examination for a Fellowship, demands a brief mention. Mark Pattison says of it¹: "The candidates are practically quite young men of from twenty-one to twenty-five, who are fresh from the Schools, and have not yet entered upon the study of any 'branch of knowledge.' It is a disadvantage to a candidate to have devoted any time to special knowledge. . . . For the competition is not an examination in acquirement, but turns mainly on the performance of exercises. Electors generally prefer the younger competitors, or rather the examination is so arranged that the younger man has the best chance in it. Colleges contrive to fix their times of election so as to catch the men who are just out of the Schools, as giving them a better field to select from. As are the candidates, such are the awarders of the prize. The whole body of Fellows are electors, who, if not mainly young men, are, as we have seen, men who, as Fellows, have given no guarantee of excellence in any 'branch of knowledge.' They naturally examine in what they know; and the conduct of the examination usually falls into the hands of the youngest on the list, as himself most fresh from the performance of the exercises of which the competition chiefly consists. A Fellowship examination is thus a mere repetition of the examinations in the Public Schools,

¹ *Suggestions*, pp. 95, 96.

by a less competent Board of Examiners. It is entirely meaningless. . . The Fellowships, as now administered, are to the academical course what the Scholarships are to the grammar school—so much prize-money offered for competition among the scholars.”

Report says that Oxford, following in the wake of Cambridge, is now gradually abandoning this system, and more and more giving Fellowships for excellent performances in the University examinations. This is satisfactory as far as it goes, as saving an additional and useless test. Consider, however, the position of the yet remaining victims, and of their partners in suffering at those Cambridge Colleges which still give Fellowships by examination or dissertation. The undergraduate enters the University at nineteen as a rule. If he is ambitious of a Fellowship he will probably take a four-year-course, at the end of which he is twenty-three. If he is not elected to a Fellowship till his third and last chance, he continues a mere examinee, untrained for any special pursuit till he is twenty-six, or more than one-third of the allotted span of human life. If he fails after all to get a Fellowship, his position is pitiable indeed.

Where a Fellowship is not given on examination, it is awarded by co-optation, the existing Fellows filling up the vacancy. The Royal Commissioners of 1850, in their Report about Cambridge were loud in their praise of the impartial manner in which they found that this delicate duty was discharged. They said that “the perfect integrity and impartiality with which Fellowships are for the most part awarded, is one of the most valuable features of the Cambridge system. A student, however friendless and unknown, provided he have the requisite qualifications of character and ability, is as sure of obtaining his Fellowship as another of better family or wealthier connexions.”¹ These words are as true now as when they were written, but they do not state the whole of the case. The figures previously given show how the richer Colleges come into the market, and by giving many valuable Scholarships buy up the best men. The result is that they have not

¹ *Report*, p. 156.

Fellowships available for all those who take a high place in a Tripos. On the other hand, the smaller and poorer Colleges may have more Fellowships than they have good men to fill them. They very often fill up vacancies by electing those whom the larger foundations have no room for, but a College always prefers a man of its own if there is one at all suitable. The result is that men from a small College who have taken a lower degree get Fellowships, while men from a larger College who have taken a higher degree are left out. This is a serious drawback to the Fellowship system as at present worked. There is another consideration generally present to the minds of the electing body which the Commissioners did not mention. The members of a College staff see much of one another, they work together, dine together, live together in the same building. Personal qualifications must therefore be taken into account in the choice of a colleague, or friction may result. It is obviously of great importance that the new Fellow should be someone with whom the existing Fellows can work and live, and no secret is made of this fact at Cambridge. If there is but one man available the College does its duty, personal qualifications or no personal qualifications; but if there are two or more men in the field, the choice naturally falls on the one who will be the most agreeable to live with and to work with. This is where the Social Club side of a College comes in.

The various forms of Fellowships have thus been tried, and each has been found wanting. The conclusion to be drawn is that the final step must be taken, and Fellowships abolished, the title of Fellow alone remaining. The name may be kept because of its historical associations, and because it has a commercial value in the outside world; but the emoluments, if not the privileges, must go.

The possibility of making teaching at Cambridge a career now becomes manifest. We have already assumed that a centralised management of College property and domestic business would result in an increased income. The Common University Fund would automatically benefit thereby. If in addition the whole of the Fellowship and Lectureship funds were

thrown into one by each of the proposed groups of Colleges, the saving effected would admit of a graduated scale of payments of increased amounts, with pensions on retirement. The scheme might be worked somewhat as follows: There would be Junior Lectureships and Senior Lectureships. Young men would not be appointed to them immediately on taking a degree. They would be required to undergo a preliminary training; or, if that were dispensed with, to serve a year on probation. The posts would be thrown open to competition, and previous experience would count. The candidates would seek such experience in the Public Schools or the provincial Universities, and look to return to Cambridge when they had won a reputation elsewhere. The Sub-Professorships and Professorships in the University would supply the next stage for legitimate ambition; and here also a pension scheme, with retirement at a proper age, could be put in operation. The Universities have such strong natural attractions that they might then fairly expect to draw to themselves the pick of the teaching profession. The principle of emulation would be preserved, though in a different form from that which found favour with the Commissioners of 1850.

Bursars and Stewards have now disappeared. Fellowships as sinecures, as part payments of salaries, and as pensions, have also disappeared. The Teachers and the Tutors alone survive. Over them it will be natural to place the Master. He will no longer be a sinecurist, but the active working head of a great educational combination, the chief guardian and guide of the undergraduates, the chief adviser of studies, taking also, if possible, a share in the work of teaching, with a sufficient staff under him, and retiring in due time on a pension.

Such is a possible scheme of Federation, on the assumption that the University is first and foremost a place of teaching. Obviously it is but one of the very many schemes which might be devised, for the Federal principle is extremely elastic, and may be embodied in a great variety of forms. The British Empire contains at least three such forms. In South Africa, the constituent States, in their desire to form a strong central Govern-

ment, have divested themselves of their powers to such an extent that they remain little more than County Councils. In Australia, the opposite policy has prevailed; and the States, in a spirit of jealous independence, have conceded the bare minimum, without which a central authority would be impossible. Canada has striven, not without success, to hold the balance even between the two extremes. What may be called the South African policy could be applied to our old Universities. The whole property, both of University and Colleges, might be managed in common, and the income applied as the central authority thought fit. The University would then appoint all the teachers, prescribe all the courses of study, and in a word centralise the whole work and management. The Colleges would then sink to the level of Hostels, having indeed a corporate life of their own—for nothing could deprive them of that—the inmates still living together, working together, and taking recreation together; but all else would be gone.

The above scheme has been framed on quite different lines, the object being to preserve to the Colleges as much of their independence and separate life as is consistent with an efficient and economically managed University. It could be brought into operation gradually. Offices which had been rendered superfluous would not be filled up when they fell vacant, though it would be a great advantage if the State would grant a substantial sum whereby those persons who did not fall into the new state of things could be pensioned off, and so the full working of the scheme be accelerated. Six powerful institutions would emerge, strong in numbers, and with ample resources, which could compete with one another on fair terms. Such a prospect ought not to be without attraction, especially to the smaller Colleges. Life would surely be much more worth living under the new conditions than under the old. But that is not the main argument in their favour. The question is one of education, and of service to the whole nation. The Colleges are educational institutions, and their emotions ought to respond to an educational appeal, if it is rightly made. Why should not they themselves take the lead? To compare small things with great—they are now in the position of the

American States in 1782. What an inestimable advantage it would be if they would come together and frame a constitution for the University. Is there no Alexander Hamilton, one knowing both the Colleges and the University from the inside, who will come forward and show the way?¹

SECTION II. UNIVERSITY ORGANISATION.

We have thus far considered suggestions whereby the University of Cambridge can be made an organic whole. It will further require a Constitution adapted to its new condition. Let us then take in succession the five parts of the existing order of things:—(1) the Chancellor; (2) the Vice-Chancellor; (3) the Council of the Senate; (4) the Electoral Roll; and (5) the Senate.

(1) THE CHANCELLOR.

The Chancellor is the King of the University, dwelling apart and remote, the interpreter of the Statutes, and the arbiter in cases of grave dispute. His powers in this latter capacity will have to be extended. If any difference arises between the University and the Colleges on a point of finance or of teaching, or between the various Boards, he will have to decide it.

(2) THE VICE-CHANCELLOR.

The Vice-Chancellor is the visible representative of the Chancellor and the working head of the University,

¹ The whole problem of University organisation has had fresh light thrown on it by the recently published Report of the Royal Commission on London University. There the problem is also one of Federalism and is recognised by the Commissioners as such. Here are some of the conclusions to which they have come:—

“We agree that the power to control teaching is of more importance than the power to test it by granting degrees.”

“The power of the purse is indeed the most important means of control which the University should possess if it is to organise the teaching with which it is concerned.”

“Experience has shown that the University cannot be certain of securing suitable conditions for the teachers when they are paid for by bodies over which they have no financial control. The first necessity is therefore that the University should provide its own teaching, by which we mean that it should appoint, pay, pension and dismiss its teachers, and not leave these primary duties in the hands of independent corporations.”

“Economical administration of limited funds is inconsistent with financial rivalry between independent institutions.” (*Report*, pp. 17, 46, 48.)

elected from the Heads of the Colleges. He serves for two years; that is to say, just as he is beginning to know his work he leaves it. If the suggestions made above as to the grouping of the Colleges are carried out, there will be but six persons available, and a longer term of office will thus become a necessity. It may be assumed, however, in that case that matters will have to be carried further and the University given a permanent Head like the Principal of a Scottish University. There must be a central driving force to keep the whole machinery in motion. To this end a free choice must be given to the general Governing Body of the University, whatever that body shall hereafter be determined to be. The Vice-Chancellor should be paid an adequate salary and have an official residence with a proper staff under him. So great would be the number of his duties that it would be advisable to give him a Deputy, also with an adequate salary. The Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor should be (as the Vice-Chancellor is now) *ex officio* members of the Council and of all Boards and Syndicates, but each Board and Syndicate should elect its own Chairman, who would be responsible for the work of the Board or Syndicate and preside over its deliberations. The Vice-Chancellor (and his Deputy) could thus keep himself in touch with all the most important parts of University work, instead of being overwhelmed with business as he now is through being the Chairman on all occasions. Both he and his Deputy should retire, say, at sixty-five, special powers being given to prolong their tenure of office till seventy, and adequate pensions should be granted them.

(3) THE COUNCIL OF THE SENATE.

The Council of the Senate is the Cabinet. It consists of the Chancellor (who never attends), the Vice-Chancellor, and sixteen other members chosen according to "orders"—*i.e.* four Heads of Houses, four Professors, and eight ordinary members of the Senate.

The Council recently proposed the following scheme for its own reform,¹ but withdrew it without taking a

¹ *University Reporter*, March 1, 1910, p. 681.

vote on it':—"That the Council of the Senate shall consist (in addition to the Chancellor) of

- (i.) The Vice-Chancellor;
- (ii.) The Vice-Chancellor-elect (from the date of his election);
- (iii.) Sixteen members, provided that not more than three of the sixteen are members of the same College, always subject to the restriction that, if a member of any College becomes a member of any other College, he shall (for the purpose of election into the Council) be regarded as belonging only to the College which he has last joined."

The three Orders were thus to be abolished, and freedom of choice given.

At the time of writing, a similar reform is on the way to be carried at Oxford. On May 6th² of this year (1913) Congregation passed a series of resolutions dealing with the composition of the Hebdomadal Council. Resolutions were carried without a division that the number of elected members should continue to be eighteen, and that their existing distribution between six Heads of Houses, six Professors or Readers, and six members of Convocation should be discontinued. A resolution to retain three seats for Heads of Houses and six for Professors was negatived by 60 votes to 53, and a resolution retaining six seats for Professors, while abolishing the special representation of Heads of Houses, was lost by 59 votes to 52. Finally, a resolution that the whole eighteen seats should be open to all members of Convocation of five years' standing was carried by 63 votes to 45. It was unanimously agreed that non-attendance should be substituted for non-residence as a cause of vacating a seat on the Council. If Convocation agrees to the resolutions passed by Congregation, Oxford will have taken a stride ahead of Cambridge.

But neither the Cambridge nor the Oxford scheme would quite fit in with the changes sketched above. The Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor would be

¹ *Ib.* October 17, 1910, p. 109.

² See *Times*, May 7th, 1913.

ex officio members of the Council (but not the Chancellor). There are two Boards of special importance already in existence, the General Board of Studies and the Financial Board. A third has been found necessary for our reformed University, a Board of Management and Works. Later on two more Boards will be put forward as desirable, a Board of Examinations and a Board of Post-graduate Studies and Research. If these Boards elect their own Chairmen, there will be five officials, corresponding to the heads of Government departments. They must be *ex officio* members of the Council, or, so to speak, Cabinet Ministers. The total number of *ex officio* members will thus be seven, leaving eleven places to be filled by the general Governing Body. This it must be able to do without any restriction of choice.

(4) THE ELECTORAL ROLL.

The Electoral Roll is the House of Commons. It consists mainly of all Masters of Arts or persons of an equivalent or higher degree who live within a mile and a half of Great St. Mary's Church. Of these there are not far short of 700. This is the working legislative body of the University. The reconstruction of it, suggested by the Reform Committee, was as follows:¹—

“(1) That Congregation (the new name for it, borrowed from Oxford) shall consist of members of the Senate who belong to any of the following classes:

- (a) The Chancellor, High Steward, Vice-Chancellor University Representatives, and University Officers, the Professors, Readers, and University Lecturers.
- (b) The Heads, Resident Fellows, and Resident ex-Fellows of Colleges.
- (c) Resident members of the Senate doing such work for the University or a College or a Public Hostel as may be recognised from time to time by Decree of the Senate as qualifying for membership of Congregation.
- (d) Resident members of the Senate who have been members of Congregation for ten years (not necessarily consecutive).

¹ Report, p. 3.

“(2) That the University shall have power to determine by Decree of the Senate from time to time what constitutes residence.”

The Council of the Senate made proposals much on the same lines, only with further concessions to vested interests.¹ They were rejected. Here again Oxford has outstripped Cambridge.

There is one point which may here be dealt with. If the Universities are to be efficient parts of a national system of education, they must be kept in touch with the other parts of that system and with the national life also. This necessity has been used as an argument in defence of two things—Prize Fellows, and of the supreme control wielded over the Universities by the absentee members of the Senate. It has been, and is, argued that the Prize Fellows, who take their money, go away and live where they like, yet keep the University in touch with the outside world; and the same contention has been urged on behalf of the Non-Resident members of the Senate. What fails to be done by either of the above-mentioned devices ought to be done in a scientific manner. An example may be taken from the recently issued Report of the Royal Commission on the University of London. The Court which it is there proposed to set up² consists very largely of persons appointed from outside. Such bodies as the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal College of Surgeons, the Institute of Civil Engineers, the Council of Legal Education, the Royal Institute of British Architects, the London Chamber of Commerce, the Royal Agricultural Society, the Headmasters' Conference, the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, and many others, are proposed for representation on it. The same policy should be adopted for Cambridge. As the University is so intimately connected with teaching, what more natural and fitting than that the National Union of Teachers, the Headmasters' Conference, and the Incorporated Association of Headmasters, should be in official connexion with it? Further, as the University now gives instruction in Agriculture, Engineering, Architecture, Economics, not

¹ *University Reporter*, Oct. 17, 1910, pp. 106-8.

² *Report*, pp. 156-160.

to mention the older Faculties of Law and Medicine, it ought to be kept in touch with the outside bodies which represent these and other subjects. In this way what has hitherto been done, either haphazard or not at all, would be done systematically and scientifically.

If the number of subjects taught at Cambridge continues to increase, and the number of students increases also, the Electoral Roll with these additions from outside might in time become an unwieldy body. It might thus be well to limit the size of it from the outset, and to lay down a rule that it should consist definitely, say, of 500 members, 450 actual residents and 50 representatives of other bodies.

A body of this kind might safely be released from the absurd restrictions which now hamper the deliberations of the Senate. Discussion and voting need no longer be separated,¹ and amendments could be proposed and carried. The power of initiative might also be given. At present only the Council of the Senate can frame and present Graces or legislative proposals. A fixed proportion of members of the Electoral Roll might have the same privilege conferred on it, say 25, or 5 per cent. This would be a return to the ante-1856 practice in a form suited to modern conditions. If this number of members agreed on a proposal, the Council would have to bring forward a Grace embodying it, and submit it to the general verdict.

Opportunity may here be taken to cite an instance of the anomalous relations which still prevail between the University and the Colleges—relations which, as Lord Curzon points out, have never been defined.² On November 14th, 1912, the Vice-Chancellor addressed the following letter to each of the Masters of Colleges:—³

“MY DEAR SIR,—One of the earliest duties which confronted me on entering upon the Vice-Chancellorship was the adjudication on claims for admission to the Electoral Roll. This duty—difficult enough in itself—is

¹ By Chapter III., Sec. 1, of the Statutes it is enacted that “no vote shall be taken at the time of discussion.”

² *Principles*, p. 103.

³ *Cambridge University Reporter*. March 19th, 1912, p. 252.

made more difficult to successive Vice-Chancellors by a want of uniformity among the various Colleges in their interpretation of what is meant by 'residence.'

"The Act of Parliament (*The Cambridge University Act 1856*) constituting the Electoral Roll (see *Statutés*, p. 123) requires for admission to the Roll (except in cases of *ex officio* membership) that the candidate shall be a Member of the Senate and shall have resided within one mile and a half of Great S. Mary's Church for fourteen weeks at the least between the first day of the preceding Michaelmas Term and the first day of the [then] month of October.

"Now it is clear that the only means the Vice-Chancellor for the time being has of ascertaining these qualifications is through the authorities of the various Colleges; and it seems to have been the practice hitherto to accept this return without question. But some Colleges are stricter in their interpretation of the Act of Parliament than others; and it is very difficult to adjudicate on the claims of gentlemen whose names are omitted by their College, but who can point to Members of other Colleges with similar, or perhaps less satisfactory qualifications, whose names have remained for years on the Electoral Roll.

"The meaning of the word 'residence' in the corresponding Act for the University of Oxford was decided in an action brought before the Court of Queen's Bench (7 May, 1872), *The Queen v. the Vice-Chancellor and the Hebdomadal Council of the University of Oxford*, when Lord Chief Justice Cockburn said: "'Resident" must be construed strictly, . . . it must be actual residence. We must construe residence with reference to the obvious meaning of the word. Here residence is the essence of the qualification. . . . It is an actual, as distinguished from a constructive, residence that is required by the Act.'

"It has been held (1897, 2 Irish Reports, 563) that 'residence' means primarily the dwelling and home where a man is supposed usually to live and sleep; as Lord Blackburn put it, 'a man's residence is where he habitually sleeps' (1, O'M. & H., 1858). In the Oxford case, the mere sleeping 'from time to time' was held to

be insufficient. There must, to constitute an actual residence, be a usual and habitual sleeping in the place.

"It seems to me that the Vice-Chancellor for the time being is bound by the decision quoted above, and that it is his duty to follow it in deciding any cases that come before him.

"May I venture therefore to express the hope that College authorities will in future make it their uniform practice to adopt the strict interpretation of the word 'residence' in the preparation of their returns?

"I am,

"Very faithfully yours,

"S. A. DONALDSON,

"Vice-Chancellor."

The extraordinary spectacle is here presented of the Colleges determining on their account, and in different ways, who shall or shall not be members of a purely University body. The Vice-Chancellor "ventures to express the hope" that they will for the future all decide in the same way, *i.e.* in the legal way; but if a College disregards this expression of opinion, and goes on doing what it has always done, what then? The Vice-Chancellor can continue to express hopes, but he is otherwise powerless. Have we not here an example of what the Oxford Commissioners of 1850 so gently call "an unconsciousness of the claims of the University"?

(5) THE SENATE.

The Senate is the whole body of voters. It is made up of all the Resident and Non-Resident Masters of Arts or holders of a superior degree. These number about 7,000, and have a vote on practically all University matters. This the Non-Residents only give on special occasions (such as Degrees for Women, Compulsory Greek, or Abolitions of Tests for Theological Degrees); but there they are, vastly outnumbering the Residents, and ready at any moment to act as a final Court of Appeal under a system of Referendum, voting a simple Yes or No.

The Reform Committee, to which reference has so often been made, and the Council of the Senate after it, took up the question of the Senate first of all. They were

confronted with two difficulties: (1) That the existing M.A.'s are not fully representative of those who have taken a degree, owing to the fact that a very large number of B.A.'s do not proceed to their M.A.¹; (2) that the Non-Residents are out of touch with University work and thought, and thus are not competent to legislate for it. As for (2), the Committee suggested² that the Residents should be erected into a Legislative Assembly, and that practically all business should come before it in the first instance, but in every case an appeal was to "lie to the Senate as a whole, provided that a sufficient number of the opponents of the proposal submitted were prepared to take the necessary steps." The Committee gave up the attempt to assign separate functions to their reconstituted Electoral Roll, and the Senate. The Council of the Senate proposed to legislate on similar lines, but, as has already been told, the Non-Residents came up and carried the day against it.

The common-sense outsider would probably give up at once the idea of making some 7000 persons scattered all over the habitable world the deciding body in the delicate and complicated work of University education. He would instinctively look to the men on the spot, to those engaged in actual teaching or administration either in the University or the Colleges, to direct what they, and they alone, can be fully acquainted with. My own personal conviction is that nothing can be made of the Senate as a governing body. It will always remain an obstruction to progress, however ingeniously its activities may be limited. Lord Curzon favours the suspensory veto. He says:³ "It might, for instance, be enacted that if a Statute were passed by Congregation by a certain majority for two successive years, it should become law unless it were thrown out by Convocation by an equivalent or some other majority. Or it might be laid down that if a measure passed Congregation by a certain majority, it could only be rejected by a certain majority of those voting in Convocation. Many variations of this form of limited prerogative will suggest themselves.

¹ In 1909 over 800 men took the B.A., and about 320 the M.A.

² *Report*, p. 2.

³ *Principles and Methods*, p. 40.

These ideas of reform seem to follow the line of least resistance." Let those who favour such schemes frame them. My own preference is for self-government. The argument for self-government is strengthened by the particular form of the Electoral Roll proposed above. The 50 representatives of outside bodies, who presumably would be men of eminence in their own departments, would never consent to see the decisions they had helped to make, overridden by a body of more or less ignorant outsiders.

The adoption of a reformed Electoral Roll as the governing body of the University would have the further advantage of settling the Women's Degrees difficulty. Why women who have passed the same examinations as the men should not be allowed to write the same letters after their names is a thing hard to be understood. The reason at the bottom of the opposition is that familiar friend, "the thin end of the wedge." It is feared that if women were allowed to take the M.A. degree, they might go on to claim membership of the Senate, and a share in the government of the University. But if the mere taking the M.A. no longer made a man a member of the governing body of the University, this fear would vanish, and a particularly odious incapacity be abolished by general consent.

SECTION III. ADJUSTMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY TO NATIONAL EDUCATION.

The third branch of University Reform is to bring the reorganised University into touch and true relations with the rest of our system of National Education.¹ Some may argue that effort in this direction is superfluous, that our ancient Universities are adapting themselves to modern conditions, and they may point for proof to the increase in the number of students, the multiplication of subjects of study, and the corresponding

¹ The question of the relation of Universities and University Colleges to Secondary Education is discussed in the Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education 1895, pp. 218-255. Points of special interest are: Effect of the Entrance Scholarships, pp. 221-224; Poverty qualification and Local Authorities, p. 226; Reduction in value of Scholarships, p. 226; Proper age for Matriculation, pp. 230-232; University Extension and Secondary Education, pp. 249-254.

growth of the teaching staff. These contentions deserve investigation.

Let us take the number of students first. The modern history of Cambridge University begins at 1850, the date of the first Royal Commission. During the 30 years, 1850 to 1880, the numbers of Freshmen were exactly doubled, rising from 400 to 800 per annum.¹ In 1882 the new Statutes came into force, both for the University and the Colleges, as the result of the Act of 1877. The upward movement continued at Cambridge, and in 1887 the matriculations for the first time exceeded a thousand, the exact number being 1,012. It was three years before the thousand was again reached, the matriculations for 1890 being 1,027. Then another drop took place, and 16 years elapsed before there was another four-figure entry. The numbers for recent years are :—

Year.	Matriculations.
1906	1,067
1907	1,083
1908	1,164
1909	1,163
1910	1,218
1911	1,191
1912	1,156

These figures represent a growth with many fluctuations. Here are two striking facts. Both Oxford and Cambridge were in the first quarter of the Seventeenth Century as large as they were till 1850, that is, for 225 years; and, secondly, if there were now the same proportion to population of students entering as there was in 1600-1625, Oxford and Cambridge would be receiving annually 5,000 freshmen. The proportion in 1630 was one in every 3,600 of the male population of England and Wales; at the present day it is one in 9,000.² This cannot be regarded as an exhilarating result. The slow rate of progress points to something wrong somewhere.

It is not that Cambridge has gone back to the slumbers of the eighteenth century. On the contrary, it has made persistent and courageous efforts to adapt itself to modern conditions. The last fifty years, and especially the last twenty-five years, show a great increase in the number of subjects taught, and of people to teach them.

¹ Venn, *Matriculations*, p. 17.

² *Ib.* p. 12.

Originally there was but one Tripos at Cambridge—the Mathematical.

In 1815, came the Civil Law Classes—now the Law Tripos; in 1824, the Classical Tripos. Then there was a long pause. The first burst of activity was from 1851 to 1856, during which time the Moral Sciences Tripos, the Natural Sciences Tripos, and the Theological Tripos were founded. Then came another pause of nearly twenty years, after which the modern period fairly set in.

In 1875, the Historical Tripos was founded; in 1878, the Semitic Languages Tripos; in 1879, the Indian Languages Tripos; in 1886, the Mediæval and Modern Languages Tripos; in 1894, the Mechanical Sciences Tripos; in 1895, the Oriental Languages Tripos (which took the places of the Semitic Languages and the Indian Languages Triposes); and in 1905, the Economics Tripos. This year (1913) an Anthropological Tripos has been agreed to.

Since 1875 the number of Triposes has grown from six to twelve, or exactly twice as many. To put the facts in another way—a student can now take Honours in Mathematics, Classics, Law, Natural Science, Moral Science, Theology, History, Oriental Languages (including Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Sanskrit, Persian, and Chinese), in Mediæval and Modern Languages (including English, Icelandic, Gothic, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and Russian), in Engineering, Economics, and Anthropology. Degrees can be taken in Medicine and Music, and Diplomas are given for Agriculture, Anthropology, Architecture, Forestry, Geography, Mining Engineering, Psychological Medicine, Sanitary Science, and Tropical Medicine. Men can be trained practically as physicians and surgeons at Addenbrooke's Hospital, as engineers in the Mechanical Laboratory, as farmers at the Experimental Farm on Madingley Road, as teachers at the Day Training College, and for the Army in the Officers' Training Corps. They can also be specially prepared for the Indian Civil Service and the Foreign Service. Finally, they can be admitted as Advanced Students in various branches of learning; that is to say, members of other Universities, or, in special cases, persons who are not members of a University at all, may enter as advanced students and obtain a degree.

There has been a corresponding increase in the number of teachers. Since 1870, fourteen additional Professorships have been founded. There are now fifty-one Professors, fourteen Readers, sixty-four University Lecturers, eighteen University Teachers, and thirty-five Demonstrators. In 1870 there was one Demonstrator and one Teacher. The above list, which does not include the Lecturers in Military Science, Mining Engineering, or Forestry, makes a total of 182 teachers of one grade or another. The College Lecturers number some 200, so that the teaching staff of the University and Colleges combined numbers about 380, or about one teacher for every ten undergraduates. Cambridge strives to teach all that a complicated modern society can demand to know. The cause of its stagnation in numbers is not its failure to provide the best and most varied instruction.

Multiplication of Buildings.

Nor does the cause lie in the refusal to spend money on buildings and equipment. This point was well put by Mr. Dickson of Peterhouse, in the last debate on Compulsory Greek at Cambridge. "Since 1882," he said, "they had spent on an average £15,000 a year to make themselves more efficient—or in the last 15 years £225,000. They had recently also spent £100,000 on new buildings—say £300,000 altogether in 15 years—and they had no increase to show in the number of their students. Why was this?"

There is no mystery about the obstacle in the way of the expansion of Cambridge—it is the heavy cost of a University education. Mark Pattison put the matter in a nutshell when he wrote: "Let Oxford become the first school of science and learning in the world, and at the same time let it be accessible at the cost only of board and lodging, and it will attract pupils enough."¹ On this point issue must be joined with the Reform Committee, who in their Report say: "The Committee are of opinion that, with the large sums given to students, a Cambridge education is accessible to any student, however poor, who has given evidence of ability."² They arrive at this conclusion in the following way:—

¹ *Suggestions*, p. 81.

² *Report*, p. 16.

“The Committee have given some consideration to the question of University and College fees, and to the necessary expense incurred by the student at Cambridge.

“The fees paid to the University by each undergraduate (who takes his degree in the normal course in nine terms), for Matriculation, Capitation Tax, Examination and Degree fees, amount in all to about £25, spread over the three years. The Colleges are also taxed by the University on the payments made to them by their members,¹ so that indirectly a somewhat larger sum is received by the University from undergraduates.

“Apart from College fees for admission and degrees, the fixed payments made to the Colleges for tuition and establishment charges range from £30 to £40 per annum for each student. Other expenses vary with the habits and requirements of each student.

“The Committee, after investigating the subject, are of opinion that the expenses of a careful student need not exceed £120 for the Academic year. This does not include the student's expenses during the vacations, nor his clothes, nor travelling expenses. Students studying Medicine or Natural Science incur special expenses for laboratory fees which increase the cost on the average by about £20 a year. The expense to a student of Engineering is somewhat greater. If a student resides during the usual portion of the Long Vacation he incurs an additional expense of £12 to £25, according to the amount of instruction required.

“The Committee are informed that a sum of £80 or £90 will enable a Non-Collegiate student to meet his Cambridge expenses for the Academic year.

“In view of the increasing demands made on both the University and the Colleges, the Committee cannot anticipate any diminution in the fixed charges made to students by the University and the Colleges. As regards the variable expenses of undergraduates, the Committee are of opinion that the principle of fixed inclusive charges, already adopted at some Colleges, whether in connection with the hostel system or not, affords an effective means by which the expenditure of the student can be regulated and reduced.

¹ *i.e.* on half the tuition fees.

“The Committee, however, believe that, as stated above, and with the exceptions specified, a careful student attached to a College may cover his Cambridge expenses for £120 a year, and that a Non-Collegiate student may cover his expenses for £80 or £90 a year. In both cases these amounts may with great economy be diminished still further.

“In the consideration of expense the amount of help given by the Colleges to the students should be borne in mind. College Scholarships and Exhibitions amount to over £35,000 a year. Much additional help is given to students who stand in special need of further assistance, whether scholars or not.”

Some further examination of these figures is necessary before their full force is realised. The £120, which a careful student is supposed to find sufficient, does not include “expenses during the vacations, nor his clothes, nor travelling expenses.” Men are “up” about eight weeks each term, or 24 weeks in the year. There are therefore 28 other weeks during which they have to be maintained. Reckoning the cost of this at the moderate sum of 10s. a week, a further £14 must be added to the £120. Clothes will cost at least £20 a year; and if the student resides at an average distance of 120 miles from Cambridge, six journeys to and fro will cost £3. Most men like to play games, and in many Colleges there is a lump sum per term which covers all the Clubs. In a College bill which lies before me, College Clubs are £1 15s. per term, or £5 5s. 0d. a year. There is no compulsion to pay this subscription, but it will be readily understood that it makes a difference to a man’s position whether he does so or not. Is this, or a similar item, included in the £120, and is any allowance made for books and pocket money? Assuming that everything has been reckoned in, the £120 has still grown to £157, without counting Long Vacation expenses. To this, £20 must be added in the case of Natural Science students; and £25, say, for Engineering students. The £157 rises in these cases to £177 and £182, and it is the students from the more recently founded Secondary Schools who take these subjects—a poorer class as contrasted with those who come from the great Public

Schools. If a Long Vacation is added, with from £12 to £25 extra, the figures mount again to £189 and £207.

There is another point to be considered. The heaviest financial burden comes on the parent at the beginning of his son's University career. Let us suppose the son in question takes the Previous Examination in October immediately before entering. There will then be:—Previous Examination Fee, £3 10s. 0d.; Matriculation Fee, £5 0s. 0d.; Caution Money to College, £15 0s. 0d.; Entrance Fee to College (varying), say, £2 10s. 0d.; or £25 10s. 0d. in all. If the student takes rooms in College there will be furniture to be paid for, (unless the rooms are let furnished at a higher rent), and £25 will be a moderate sum wherewith to furnish and equip a sitting-room, a bed-room, and a gyp-room. Here then is an initial expenditure of £50 down, with at least £150, and it may be £200, for three years more. This is a long way from the Mark Pattison ideal of a University accessible at the cost of board and lodging only.

Of course there is, on the other side, the plea of the special help given by the Colleges, amounting to the very large sum of £35,000 a year. Cambridge University is an expensive place of education, with its costliness tempered by a system of Scholarships and Exhibitions. The next step is to examine this system. We must begin by distinguishing between Scholarships and Exhibitions: the former being prizes given for ability in examinations; the latter, strictly speaking, being bestowed as charitable gifts to help poverty.

The Scholarship system can best be tested by giving the actual awards. Taking the current academical year 1912-1913, in four of the smaller Colleges the results are not accessible to the public; of the thirteen remaining Colleges, three give only the subjects for which the awards are made, and the remainder give both the subjects and the amounts. The results given are accordingly only approximate. They are as follows:—

Number of Scholarships awarded.

Classics.	Mathe- matics.	Science.	History.	Engi- neering.	Modern Lan- guages.	Hebrew.	Total.
60½	37½	40½	21½	1	5	1	167

(Where a Scholarship is given for two subjects, half is counted to each.)

The money values, so far as they are given, are :

Classics.	Mathe- matics.	Science.	History.	Engi- neering.	Modern Lan- guages.	Hebrew.	Total.
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
2,410	1,935	1,955	740	80	140	40	7,300

At Cambridge, as at Oxford,¹ Classics head the list. Its predominance would be increased if the money values for King's were available. The four Entrance Scholarships appropriated at that College to Eton and the Open Entrance Scholarships are mainly given in this subject. Cambridge does far more for Mathematics and Science than Oxford. History too is better helped; as at Oxford less than one-fifth of the number of Scholarships are given for it, as compared with the number given for Classics, while the proportion at Cambridge is just over a third. Cambridge has thus shown itself much more open to modern influences than Oxford, especially with regard to Science. The predominance of Science over both Classics and Mathematics in the number of its students is the great feature of modern Cambridge. For all that, Classics remain the chief bounty-fed subject. The great Public Schools carry off the lion's share of the spoils in the shape of Scholarships. These Schools are the recognised highways to the Universities; and by adding Science to the two older subjects they have contrived to maintain their ancient superiority. The candidates who are the best prepared have the best chance. The rich foundations win the prizes because of the splendid tuition which they can give. The result is that many of the Scholarships are won by men who do not need them. What proportion these bear to the whole number it is impossible to say, but most people will put it higher than Lord Curzon does. He has his own special standard of poverty, and in proportion as that standard is lowered we shall approximate to Bishop Gore's statement, that two out of five, or 40 per cent. of the scholars of Oxford, do not need the emoluments they receive.²

¹ See Lord Curzon's table at p. 77 of his book.

² *Principles and Methods*, pp. 82, 83.

Exhibitions raise the difficult question of helping poverty. To inquire into a man's means is always an invidious task, and the Colleges are ill-fitted to perform it. If it is to be done at all, it had better be done locally. And here surely there might be more co-operation between the Universities and the County Councils and the County Borough Councils acting as the local education authorities. Most of these bodies have Scholarship schemes which include the helping of poor students to take a University course. They have special facilities for finding out the real financial position of parents and guardians.

Scholarships and Exhibitions then are mere palliatives; they do not go to the root of the matter, and the problem of the expensiveness of a University career still faces the reformer as it did in 1854, and 1856, and again in 1877. In the Acts of 1854 and 1856 the great idea was to provide Halls or Hostels for poor men. The Halls never got started in any appreciable number. Where they exist to-day they are not popular, and men escape from them as soon as they can. A Hostel saves expense by having more meals in common and by other boarding school arrangements. The men envy the greater freedom of rooms or lodgings, and are apt to think they are looked down upon by the other undergraduates as socially inferior. After the Hostels came the Non-Collegiate or Unattached Student scheme. This again is a failure, as far as Cambridge is concerned. The tables given above show that the percentage of Honour degrees to Matriculations at Fitzwilliam Hall is 7·2, and in Poll degrees 24·0, that is to say, less than one-third of all the men who enter the University as Non-Collegiate students take a degree as such. This does not mean that they are either lazier or more stupid than the other men, but that they get into a College as soon as they can. The attractions of College life are too much for them. It was in vain that the Archbishop of Canterbury got his amendment inserted in the Act of 1877 [Clause 16 (11)] enabling the University Commissioners "to make provision for diminishing the expense of University education by founding Scholarships tenable by students either at any College or Hall within the University, or as unattached students, or by paying salaries to the

teachers of such unattached students, or by otherwise encouraging such unattached students." This provision remained a dead letter.

Hostels, the Non-Collegiate student system, the Exhibition system, including Sizarships, all labour under the disadvantage of differentiating between men, and so introducing class distinctions. What is wanted is a reduction of expense which shall be common to everybody. This is matter of the more economical use of existing resources, which is again a matter of organisation. Three methods of effecting economies have already been suggested: (1) The centralised administration of College property and business; (2) the abolition of emoluments for Fellowships; (3) a centralised system of teaching. A fourth method would be to use to greater advantage the £35,000 a year, now spent on Scholarships. Let a portion of the savings from these four sources be used in abolishing all worrying fees and dues, such as Matriculation fees, Capitation Tax, Entrance fees to College, Caution Money and terminal payments to College, and above all let the tuition fees both in College and University be reduced, or if possible abolished altogether. Then an approximation will be made to the democratic ideal of board and lodging expenses and nothing beyond. Let the Colleges offer Scholarships only, and these of reduced amount, and let the Local Authorities come in with supplementary grants in aid. These need not be known to the Universities at all, and thus no class distinctions would be created. If the strain on the Local Authorities proved too great, the Government might fairly be asked to step in and increase the grant for Secondary Education, so that no student fit to come to the University should be left outside.

It will not be possible, nor would it be advisable, to do away with Scholarships altogether. Mark Pattison, who has been thought a misanthrope, had in this respect a touching faith in human nature. He says¹: "Free intelligence as such has an elasticity of its own. The mind in its spring puts itself forth on all sides. It requires no stimulation, but only to be directed. The reason, by its

¹ *Essays on the Endowment of Research*, pp. 17, 18.

own nature, seeks truth. The young mind desires to know, to explore the unknown, to find out the nature and causes of things. The task of the teacher is easy; it is only to satisfy this longing. He has but to guide and aid; he may have to restrain ardour, never to urge reluctance. The stimulus to acquisition is within. . . . This method is wholly voluntary; it submits to no compulsion from the State, it employs no artificial allurements, but depends entirely upon the attraction which Science, Letters, and the humanities exert upon the classes possessed of wealth and leisure. In opposition to this method stands the method of recruitment by bounties."

The faults of our systems of elementary and secondary education may be the cause why this spontaneous desire for knowledge is not more often seen; but here again the reformer must take things as they are. Emulation is a stimulus to learning, and as such cannot yet be dispensed with. The Scholar's distinctive gown and his special table in Hall are stimuli of an inexpensive character, and might be generally adopted. Besides these, there must be Scholarships, but these should be awarded in a far more scientific manner than at present. The Scholarship system, as it exists at Cambridge, is open to several grave objections. The date of the Examinations is too early. On May 16th of this year the great group of six Colleges—Pembroke, Caius, Jesus, Christ's, St. John's and Emmanuel—offered 56 Entrance Scholarships and a large number of Exhibitions to be competed for on December 2nd next. The Examinations for Trinity, Clare and Trinity Hall will be held on the same date. Of old, Entrance Scholarship Examinations used to be held in March or April. In the eagerness of the Colleges to be first in the field and so carry off the best men, the date has been gradually moved forward till it is now at the very beginning of December—nearly a year before the successful candidates enter the University. Two disadvantages result. Students at this period of their mental development often come on very rapidly, and an examination of the same candidates held some months later would in many cases show different results. Candidates should be tested as near the time of their coming up as possible. Again, the winner of a Scholarship is tempted to think

he has already attained, and, by a natural reaction, to rest on his oars. A later date of examination would minimise this disadvantage. With groups of Colleges and single Colleges holding examinations at different times for Scholarships of different values, there must inevitably be different standards and different degrees of merit. Some who deserve to succeed fail, because they go where the competition is excessive, and some succeed, who, because the competition is small and the standard low, deserve to fail. The University obviously ought to step in and hold the examination itself, so that there should be one standard for all alike. Candidates would be allowed to put down their names for any College or group of Colleges in the order in which they preferred them, and in the event of success would be assigned to the College of their choice so far as was possible. Scholarships should be of two sorts only, Minor and Major, say of £40 and £60 a year each. Both should be tenable for one year only as a period of probation. The University should examine again at the end of the year, displacing the College "Mays." Then the election would be to a Foundation Scholarship for two years, with power to the Colleges to prolong it for a third year. Honours men taking the first and second parts of a Tripos would thus be examined at the end of each year of their course, and would thereby be kept up to the mark. The number of Scholarships in each subject should not be definitely fixed beforehand; and the examination should be in all the subjects which can properly be taught at school, Classics Mathematics, the Natural Sciences, History, and Modern Languages. Those who come up to standard in any one (or more) of these should have scholarships awarded them, so far as the funds available permit. There should no longer be any specially bounty-fed subject.

The Colleges may be expected to offer strong opposition to these proposals. They are keen to win reputation for themselves by distinctions in the Triposes, and Scholarships are the natural means for achieving this end. After what has been said about the principle of emulation, it is impossible to condemn the Colleges on this count. But there is another road to the same result. Let the grouped Colleges vie with one another in giving

the best instruction and the best supervision, and they will have no cause to complain either of the number or the ability of the students they attract.

A University fails to do its duty as a constituent part of a national system of education, if it does not make it as easy as possible for all deserving students to avail themselves of the advantages it offers; so also it fails in its duty if it does not exclude the undeserving. At present there are many men kept away from Cambridge who ought to be here, and many here who would be better away. As an all-round reduction in the expense of a University course is needed in the case of the one set, so a University Entrance Examination is needed in the case of the other. The demand for this examination is a very old one. As long ago as December 8th, 1847, a Grace was offered for the appointment of a Syndicate to consider the expediency of instituting an examination of all students (except those of King's College) previous to their residence. It was rejected in the *Caput*. On January 14th, 1849, the Rev. J. J. Smith, of Caius College, proposed a Grace to the same effect. It was rejected in the Non-Regent House the votes being: Placets, 11; Non-Placets, 29.¹ Nor has the proposal lacked influential support. Whewell, Donaldson, Blakesley, Merivale, and Wratislaw were all in favour of it, to mention no others. The Oxford Commissioners of 1850 expressly recommended it. Archbishop Whately held that every other reform would fail if this particular one was omitted. Newman, as we have seen, selected the absence of a University Entrance Examination as the most conspicuous example of the way in which the Colleges had set their own interests before those of the University. Lord Curzon² calls attention to the fact that Oxford and Cambridge are the only two Universities in the world which have not the right of laying down their own terms of admission, and urges all the arguments that need be used in favour of giving them this right. The resistance still comes from the same quarter. The Colleges, as boarding-schools, do not like to be empty

¹ Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, Vol. IV., pp. 697, 707.

² *Principles*, p. 103.

while their neighbours are full; and, further, with their present system of finance and administration, they require all they can get in order to keep going. They are thus tempted to admit anybody who can pay his bills, whatever his attainments or want of attainments. An Entrance Examination would keep out many who now come in; therefore the Colleges will have none of it. Here is one explanation of the 21 per cent. of men who enter Cambridge and leave it without taking a degree. This year a Memorial was presented to the Senate asking for the appointment of a Syndicate "to consider the whole question of Examinations conducted by the University for which preparation nominally takes place at School." The Memorial finishes thus:—"We should not suggest that the University should interfere with the present freedom of the Colleges to admit students who have not passed the Previous Examination, as such legislation might operate harshly in particular cases." Exactly so. Nothing but an Act of Parliament will, I fear, ever give Oxford and Cambridge a University Entrance Examination.

The Colleges, for all that, have been taken in the flank by the course of events. The obvious necessity of an Entrance Examination has led to the Previous Examination, or Little-Go, gradually approximating thereto. The Previous, it may be explained, is not an examination held previous to entrance, but previous to any further examination. When it was first instituted¹ it used to be held in an undergraduate's fifth term, just half-way through his course, which was then eleven terms. The Cambridge Commissioners of 1850 noted that the Colleges had up till then defeated all attempts to put it earlier. They were in dread of the thin end of the wedge. But later attempts were more successful. The date was moved forward to the Lent Term of the first year; now the Examination may be taken before residence. Other Examinations may also be substituted for it: as the Senior Local, and the Oxford and Cambridge School Examinations. So it has

¹ The Grace establishing the Examination was passed on March 13th, 1822; the first Examination took place in the Lent Term, 1824, for undergraduates who had come into residence in October, 1822. —Cooper, *Annals*, Vol. IV., p. 535.

come about that a large number of students pass the Previous Examination, or its equivalent, before beginning residence. But the present state of things is not satisfactory. What is already done by many should henceforth be done by all. Nor is the Previous a suitable test; on the contrary, it is one of the most grotesquely absurd examinations on the face of the earth. Something better must be substituted for it.

The Memorialists above mentioned are obviously on right lines when they suggest "that it might be advisable to create a single examining body which should control both the Previous Examination and the examinations at present conducted by the Highest Grade Schools Examination Syndicate and the Local Examinations Syndicate." Such a body could frame a proper Entrance Examination, excluding therefrom Compulsory Greek, which is a great obstacle in the way of boys coming from the newer Secondary Schools. There seems no reason why this same body should not also hold the Entrance Scholarship Examination which might be the Honours portion of what the Entrance Examination would be the Pass portion. The University has appointed the Syndicate asked for, and it is to report before the end of the Lent Term, 1914.

Here again Oxford is ahead of Cambridge. A Statute for the reform of Responsions¹ (the Oxford equivalent of the Previous Examination) will be promulgated in Congregation on Tuesday, October 21. It provides that Responsions shall in future be conducted by the Delegates for the Inspection and Examination of Schools, and makes important new regulations. The distinction between stated and additional subjects is retained, the stated subjects being: (1) Greek; (2) Latin; (3) English; (4) Elementary Mathematics; and (5) one subject selected from a list which includes French, German, Italian, Spanish, English History, Geography, Elementary Politics, Elementary Logic, Elementary Trigonometry, Statics and Dynamics, and Elementary Physics and Chemistry. The Examinations will be held in March, July, September, and December, at Oxford, and at such schools and other

¹ See *The Times*, May 29th, 1913.

places as the Delegates for the Inspection of Schools may determine, and a candidate may satisfy the Examiners in the same or in separate Examinations, provided that the Delegates may prescribe that every candidate shall in one Examination satisfy the Examiners in English and in other subjects. Additional subjects, necessary for certain subsequent Examinations, may be chosen from the optional stated subjects. The general purpose of the Statute is to substitute for Responsions the school certificates of the Oxford and Cambridge Board. With the exception of (1) the alternative of set books in Greek and Latin, and (2) the addition of the optional subjects, the Examination will be of the same character and standard as that for school certificates.

If this Statute receives the approval of Congregation, a further Statute will be promulgated, the purpose of which is to provide that candidates for the ordinary Arts course shall not be allowed to matriculate until they have passed in at least three of the subjects required for Responsions, and to make provision for conferring a temporary status on certain "candidates for matriculation," who will be subject to University discipline, and, if they are ultimately matriculated, will be entitled to count the period during which they had the status, for purposes of standing and residence. This last regulation applies to candidates for Diplomas, Research Degrees, and Degrees in Music. A further Statute will be required dealing with examination exempting from Responsions.

These proposals go a long way towards establishing an Entrance Examination. It seems a pity that they do not go the whole way.

Our ideal University has now been adjusted to the national system of education in three ways: (1) The expense of a University course has been reduced to a minimum; (2) the unfit have been excluded by a proper Entrance Examination; (3) the teaching has been made sufficient and of the best. The fourth requisite is that the students shall be duly tested in the instruction given, and true certificates issued of the results.

We are thus led to the subject of Examinations and Degrees. A strange fact confronts the inquirer at the threshold. As everybody is supposed to be able to teach

in a Secondary School or a University without any previous training, so is he supposed to be able to examine by the light of nature. The supposition is a dangerous one with regard to teaching; it is still more dangerous with regard to examining. A teacher may make a mistake one day, and put it right the next; but an examiner, when once his verdict is announced, has no opportunity of revising it, and may unwittingly damage or wreck an examinee's career for the whole of his life. Cases from time to time crop up of candidates who unaccountably fail in their examinations. Are there no examiners' mistakes among them? Again, as an examiner's work is peculiarly delicate and important, one would expect to find it particularly well paid. On the contrary, it is as a rule badly paid, and is looked on as an odd job by which a few pounds can be picked up at times when other work is slack. Strange that in a country where there are so many examinations, and where so much depends on them, there should be so little system. This aspect of the case seems almost entirely to have escaped notice, and among the many educationists with whom the writing of this history has brought me in contact, I have found only one who has been struck by it. The late Dean Merivale, in his evidence before the Royal Commissioners of 1850, said¹:—"The conclusions to which I have come are these: What is faulty and imperfect in private tuition can only be corrected and supplied by raising the standard of College and Professorial Lectures, and by care in framing College and University *Examinations*. Much of the imperfection of our system is to be traced to the inexperience of examiners, and the absence of control and system which pervades the Examinations. Education in the present day, with the abundance of books and other helps, must, I conceive, tend more and more to become a cycle of Examinations; and our best endeavours ought to be directed to improving our system in this respect.

"In framing a system of Classical Examinations, such as I should like to see instituted in the University, it

¹ *Report*, pp. 174, 175.

would be important to lead the students *seriatim* through a range of proper authors. . .

"I think that it is vain to attempt to assign by legislative enactment the due place and subordination of Professors, College Tutors, and private assistants. These must and will be regulated by the sense the students entertain of their own interests. The only security the University can have for the efficiency of the instruction imparted through any of these channels is through its *Examinations*. . . I conceive that the University has the power of securing that which is the main point to aim at by a carefully and methodically arranged *system of Examinations*. At present, the most important Classical Examination (that for the Classical Tripos) is confided to very young and inexperienced examiners, and great complaints are heard of the variable and capricious manner in which it has frequently been conducted.

"Without presuming to give the details of the system I would recommend, I venture to urge that the object to be attained is a *full, searching, and methodical examination* of the Classical Students three times, at least, in the course of their three years. . . If there be these three General Examinations appointed, the authors to be read, and the kinds of composition to be practised, should be fixed and arranged on a certain system. All this would require a perfect understanding between the various Examiners, and it could only be worked under the supervision of a Board. It would be necessary, I conceive, to combine a Board of Permanent Examiners with a Staff of a more fluctuating character. . . I would try to reduce examination to a science."

The University of Cambridge has instituted a Board of Examinations, which made its first appearance in the *University Calendar* for 1874. It was confined in the first instance to the Previous and General Examinations, but has since been extended to the Specials, so that it has practically to do only with those Examinations which lead to a Poll as distinguished from an Honours Degree. It is the duty of the Board to consult together from time to time on all matters relating to the Examinations in question, and to nominate the Examiners. Here is the beginning of what Merivale desired to see. There should

be a Board dealing with the Examinations as a whole. Some kind of training or preparation for Examination work would then be feasible. A beginner could be set to do simple work under supervision, and as he showed himself competent and acquired experience, he could work his way up. When he had proved himself possessed of special capacity, he would be eligible for a permanent place on the Board.

The facts of the case emphasise the need for more system. Triposes in general are now divided into two parts which cannot be taken in the same year. One Tripos, the Oriental Languages, remains undivided. The First Part of the Mathematical Tripos may be taken at the end of the student's first year, no other First Part can be taken till the end of the second year; a Second Part cannot, as a rule, be taken till the end of the third year; but in the Theological Tripos, the First Part cannot be taken till the end of the third year, when both parts may be taken at once. It is also possible to take this Tripos up to the end of one's fifth year. In most of the Triposes, passing Part I. is now sufficient for a degree, provided a Special (the final Examination for the Ordinary Degree) other than that in the subject in which the candidate has already been examined, be taken in addition. As Part I. of the Mathematical Tripos may be taken at the end of the first year, an undergraduate may spend two years in passing any Special except the Mathematical—an extraordinary waste of time. A Part I. Law man may take any Special. These regulations gave rise to a difficulty. Part I. of a Tripos is generally taken at the end of the second year, but three years' residence is necessary for a degree. A Special is contemptible in the eyes of those who have taken a Tripos, so now a man may be excused it, if he resides three years and at the end of them can produce a certificate showing he has "diligently pursued a course of study in the University." This is an arrangement which seems to open the door to a dangerous laxity. Why have examinations at all, if certificates do as well? And why, too, have Second Parts, and then discourage them by making them unnecessary for a degree? In Part I. of the Mathematical Tripos the candidates are arranged

in three classes, in alphabetical order; in Part II. they are arranged in the same way, but the alphabetical order is qualified by marks of distinction for special merit. In the Classical Tripos there are three classes with three divisions as a rule in each; the candidates being arranged in alphabetical order in the divisions, nine classes being thus made. In the Moral Sciences Tripos there are three classes, and the second class only is divided into two divisions, the arrangement being alphabetical in both classes and divisions. In the Law Tripos, arrangement in order of merit still survives. In the Classical Tripos, the Examiners are nominated partly by the Special Board of Classical Studies and partly by the two Colleges whose turn it is to present the Proctors for that year. In all other cases they are nominated by the particular Special Board concerned. There may be reasons for all these differences, but they are hidden from all save the specially initiated. Most of the Examinations have been frequently altered without finality being reached, or a thoroughly satisfactory result attained. Others, like the Law Tripos, may escape change for nearly a quarter of a century.

The original principle was unrestricted competition—"The one good rule of unfettered and open competition," as the Cambridge University Royal Commission Report has it. In an unrestricted competition the candidates must be placed strictly in order of merit. This necessity brings with it a natural preference in the minds of the Examiners for that which is easiest to assess and mark. Facts are easier to mark than style, because style is a matter of opinion and taste, and facts are not. Cambridge examination papers, roughly speaking, are long strings of questions about facts, and the answering of them is a race against time, the man who can write fastest and pour out the greatest quantity of facts accurately and concisely stated coming out top. The possessor of the latest and best fountain pen has an advantage over a candidate who sticks to the old-fashioned quills which the University still supplies. There has been some reaction against this unrestricted competition. The alphabetical order, whether in the classes or the brackets, is proof of this. The Tripos Regulations also direct the Examiners

to have regard to style, but these modifications do not go very far. At Cambridge, facts still hold the highest place in popular esteem.

Of facts there is no end, and the love of them has led the University to overload its Honours Examinations and make them excessively difficult and complicated. Two examples may suffice. Take for one instance the First Part of the Classical Tripos. In the old days the whole undivided Tripos consisted of eleven papers, six in Translation, four in Composition, and one in History. At present the First Part of the Tripos consists of fifteen papers, five in Translation, four in Composition, and six General papers divided as follows:—

1. Philology and Syntax.
2. Short passages for translation illustrating Greek and Roman History and Antiquities.
3. General paper in the same.
4. Short passages illustrating—(1) Greek and Roman Philology; (2) Greek and Latin Literature; (3) Sculpture and Architecture.
5. General paper on—(1) a set book of Greek Philosophy; (2) Greek and Roman Literature; (3) Sculpture and Architecture.

Philology and Syntax, Greek and Roman History, Greek and Roman Antiquities, Greek and Roman Philosophy, with a set portion of an author in the former, Greek and Latin Literature, Sculpture and Architecture! Truly a portentous list, and it all may be taken, and very frequently is taken, at the end of a man's second year.

Yet it may be doubted whether the First Part of the Law Tripos is not still more heavily over-loaded. In this the subjects are General Jurisprudence, Roman Law, English Constitutional Law and History, and Public International Law. In the case of the Classical Tripos the candidates have had years of School preparation. In the case of the Law Tripos there is, or ought to have been, none, for Law is not a School subject. The Law student thus breaks entirely new ground about the middle of October, and before the end of the next May year, or in a year and seven months, is supposed to be proficient in all the subjects mentioned above. Three of these are particularly formidable:—Roman Law, English Constitutional

Law and History, and Public International Law. A man can well give a life-time to any one of them. Then there is the peculiar choice of General Jurisprudence as the fourth subject. The usual order is first the concrete, then the abstract; Arithmetic, for example, is generally taken before Algebra; but in the Law Tripos the student begins the study of abstract principles before he is allowed to make the acquaintance of English Law at all, and while he is wrestling with the totally unfamiliar system of Roman Law. Perhaps the reason why Cambridge makes the Honours Degrees so hard is because the Poll Degrees are so easy, the average of the two representing what may fairly be demanded.

There is just now a reaction against the multiplicity of Examinations, but they can never be wholly done away with. Up to a certain point no serious student would be without them. They are indispensable for testing his knowledge. But when once a student has learned how to learn, examinations are superfluous for him, and become a hindrance rather than a help. A genuine student is impatient of the beaten track, and should be left free to choose his own course at the earliest possible moment. Again, the Universities have a freedom in the matter of examinations which the State has not. The State must avoid all appearance of political partiality, and therefore is obliged to carry out the competitive principle to the full, and adopt the strict order of merit. It is the Prize Fellowship system which has exercised a like compulsion at Oxford and Cambridge; but with the disappearance of that system, greater liberty will return. Some of the elementary principles on which an Examination system should be based have thus become apparent.

1. Too much should not be attempted. It is enough to classify the candidates, which means an alphabetical order in all cases, without stars or letters, or other circumventing devices. Nor is a superfluity of classes desirable. Oxford gives the world four classes in its Honour Schools; Cambridge confines this excessive subdivision to its more elementary examinations. One wonders whether the occupants of the fourth classes ought to be allowed any place at all.

2. The examinations should not be too difficult.

However varied and elaborate a Tripos may be made, finished Mathematicians, Classics, Scientists, Historians, Theologians, Lawyers, Philosophers, and Economists cannot be turned out at from 22 to 23 years of age. If the present vain attempts so to do were abandoned, students could be admitted to the University at 18, finish their preliminary training in three years, and at 21 begin their Professional training or be free to continue their previous studies.

3. The Examinations should not entail excessive strain. The Triposes were divided to relieve the strain on the candidates. This principle should be adopted in every case, and both parts of a Tripos made necessary to a degree.¹

4. Cram is best avoided, not by asking many questions, but by giving a wide choice, plenty of time, and insisting on a thorough knowledge in such questions as are selected.

A Special Board, proceeding on well defined lines, would give the unity and consistency which are now lacking in the Cambridge Examinations.

The University of Cambridge, with all its piling up of papers and demands for an exhaustive knowledge, still sends forth annually many graduates who cannot properly be called educated men. The following are the opening sentences of the Preface to *Notes on the Composition of Scientific Papers*, by Sir Clifford Allbutt, the Regius Professor of Physic at Cambridge University:—"In the course of the year I peruse sixty or seventy theses for the degree of M.B. and about twenty-five for the degree of M.D. The matter of these theses is good, it is often excellent; in composition a few are good, but the greater number are written badly, some very ill indeed. The prevailing defect of their composition is not mere inelegance; were it so, it were unworthy of educated men: it is such as to obscure, to perplex, and even to hide or to travesty the sense itself." In plain language, these M.B.'s and M.D.'s cannot write their own mother tongue. The absence of an Entrance Examination, with a proper standard of

¹ If ever a Royal Commission is appointed, it should, among other things, take medical evidence as to the effect of the Triposes on the mental and physical conditions of the examinees.

attainment in English, is partly to blame for this lamentable state of things. Would it not be well for men taking such subjects as Engineering and Natural Science to study them historically and biographically? They would thus be introduced to great ideas and great men, with the possibility of good educational results.

There remains the question of the Pass Examinations—ought they to be retained at all? Many of the reformers, as we have seen, have been in favour of getting rid of the Poll men altogether; but they are an established institution, and may be counted on to struggle hard for their lives. The Colleges will be on their side, as they are a profitable source of income. The Pass men are charged the same tuition fee as the Honours men, but they cost less to teach, because they are taught less. The University knows them not, save to examine them, and take fees and dues from them. Both processes are profitable to it; so that until the day of financial reform comes, the Pass men will hold their ground. An improvement, however, has been made of late years in the Pass course. Of old it was Previous Examination, General Examination, Special Examination. Since the change referred to, a Poll man may take two Specials, instead of the General and a Special. A further extension of this power of choice might have beneficial results. The Triposes are highly-specialised examinations, too much so from an educational point of view, though the modern practice of allowing a candidate to take the First Part of one Tripos and then the Second Part of another is a counteracting influence. General knowledge, as opposed to special knowledge, is at a heavy discount in Cambridge; but other Universities think more highly of it, notably those in the United States. If there were a proper examination before entrance to the University, and a student had to take three Specials, one at the end of each year, and these were made into examinations worth passing, a course of study could be marked out embodying the principle of variety as opposed to that of specialisation. Such a course of study would appeal to a large number of men, and might fairly be rewarded with a degree. There should be an ample range of choice—Classics, Mathematics, Divinity, History, Law, Modern Languages,

Economics, and the various branches of Natural Science—but the student should be compelled always to take some literary subject or subjects, so as to insure his getting a humanising education. The University might then be asked to organise a course of instruction on these lines.

The nation may also fairly claim that when a University tests knowledge it should accurately describe the results; in other words, a degree should be a real proof of achievement. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge fail to come up to this standard in two notable respects, to mention no others. Firstly, they give the same titles of B.A. and M.A. to Pass men and Honours men alike; secondly, they give the degree of M.A. without any qualifications beyond those required for the B.A., save those of being three years older, and of having paid an additional fee. In both these respects their degrees tend to deceive an ignorant but confiding public. The first shortcoming might be met by making the Poll degree really worth having, as previously suggested. The second might be met by doing away with the B.A. degree altogether and giving the M.A. at once. The only difficulty in the way is the pecuniary one.

It has been previously pointed out that genuine students should be relieved from the confining and cramping influence of examinations at the earliest possible moment. The University of Cambridge has of late years done something to encourage the class known as Advanced or Research Students. Should not Oxford and Cambridge more and more make it their aim to be the places for advanced work and research, the Professorial teaching being chiefly utilised for these two purposes? Local Universities are springing up all over the country. They bring instruction to the student's own doors, and can thus teach him cheaply; they are not hampered by old traditions or obsolete methods, and are thus free to develop on their own lines. These local Universities ought to feed the older foundations with their best men, and they would do so if Oxford and Cambridge were properly organised. The structure of national education would then be on the way to completion.

This last consideration leads naturally on to the

kindred subject of the Endowment of Research. This is a difficult problem. The amount of money available for it is small. The University has a few Studentships, some of the Colleges give Research Studentships, and an occasional Research Fellowship. The present system is not above criticism. The usual plan is to give a Studentship or a Fellowship to some young man who has just taken a brilliant degree, and then to turn him loose to pursue his own way. The University or the College makes, in fact, a speculative investment; it may yield a handsome return, or it may prove a failure. The young men in question often spend the first year of their time in making up their minds as to what line of research they will pursue. Sometimes the Studentship runs out at the end of a year. If a student has not already struck out a line of his own, why is he given money before he has proved that he can use it to good purpose? If he has struck out a profitable line of investigation, why cut him short just when he is beginning to pay for encouragement?

This evil, the short period for which a Studentship can be granted, is occasionally mitigated by the grant of a Research Fellowship. But this plan is only a mitigation. There is a great reluctance to prolong these Fellowships much beyond the normal six or seven years. Even Research Fellows are human; they want a definite career so that they can marry and settle down. At present their prospects are of the most precarious nature.

The promotion of Research is obviously a work that should be undertaken in common. The University should direct it in co-operation with the Colleges, and there must be machinery for the purpose. The General Board of Studies in our reformed University would have enough to do in organising the teaching. A Special Board for Advanced Study and Research should be instituted. Existing resources could then be better utilised. The University Scholarships and Prizes might also be examined with a view to utilising them for research purposes. They should be awarded, as far as possible, on the results of the Triposes, so as to avoid the multiplication of examinations. If these proved insufficient, appeal might be made to the State and to private individuals.

Then as to the persons who should do Research; obviously those who already know the most, and are thus at the borders of their subject, can best tell how those borders may be extended. It is the most advanced teachers, the Professors and sub-Professors, who should be encouraged to undertake further investigations. To enable them to do so, it would be necessary to set them free from teaching, either entirely for short periods, or partially for longer periods. Teaching and Research must be linked more closely together. Teaching can be made a career; and the difficulty of paying adequately for Research, and getting value for the money expended, can thus be surmounted. The payment would be for the Teaching, and the Research would come in incidentally. With the highest ranks of University teachers the most brilliant of the younger men would naturally be associated. If the Advanced Students are handed over as suggested to the Professors, they will form the natural body from which to draw the Research Students, Advanced Study and Research going naturally together. An undergraduate, for example, who has just taken a first-class in the Second Part of the Classical Tripos would not be awarded a Studentship for a single year and then be abandoned to shift for himself; he would be offered the opportunity of continuing his studies at Cambridge or elsewhere, under the actual instruction and guidance of a Professor or other approved person. Then, if he showed aptitude, he should be enabled to continue his special work, and as soon as possible be given a teaching post, the duties of which were not too onerous. In this way, after a few years, the genuine lovers of Research would be discovered. They are the enthusiasts who only want to be enabled to live in order to give themselves entirely to learning. They might be made in due course Professors Emeriti, and be allowed to teach or lecture just as much or as little as they pleased. A Board of Advanced Studies and Research, with sufficient funds and accumulating experience, might be trusted to work out a solution of a problem which has hitherto been very inadequately dealt with.

The Library difficulty has not yet been solved at Cambridge.¹ Each College has its library, so that with the University Library, Cambridge possesses eighteen collections of books, none of them satisfactory. The University Library does wonders with insufficient funds. It cannot buy and house all the books it would, nor can it arrange them so as to be of the greatest advantage to students. It has long desired to have a Central Reading-room, with the necessary books, reference, and a proper staff of assistants, but it cannot afford it.

If the University Library with its privileges under the Copyright Act cannot do what it would, how hopeless is it for even the richest College to try to succeed where the University fails. Here again salvation can only come through co-operation. The University and Colleges must do the work between them. The University must definitely undertake a certain portion of it, say, the

¹ The following were the sums expended by the Colleges on their Libraries as shown by the last Abstract of Accounts (*Cambridge University Reporter*, February 19th, 1913):—

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Peterhouse				116	13	6
Clare				42	18	2
Pembroke				89	11	7
Caius				267	6	2
Trinity Hall						
Corpus				173	13	6
King's Corporate Income ...	80	6	2			
Trust Funds	117	13	4			
				197	19	6
Queens' Corporate Income ...						
Trust Fund	109	17	10	109	17	10
St. Catharine's Corporate Income						
Trust	36	11	4	36	11	4
Jesus Corporate Income ...						
Trust	54	11	3	54	11	3
Christ's Corporate Income ...	79	13	3			
Trust	25	18	1			
				105	11	4
St. John's				337	2	6
Magdalene (Library and Plate) ...				30	3	0
Trinity (including Librarian's Dividend)				1447	0	0
Emmanuel				70	0	0
Sidney Corporate Income ...	18	0	2			
Trust	76	6	6			
				94	6	8
Downing (Library and Prizes) ...				79	8	0
				£3252	14	4

The University Library for 1912 cost about £8,000.

providing the Reading Room and Reference Library with works of General Literature and foreign books; the Colleges specialising in, say, some technical branch. A beginning on something like these lines has already been made. The Squire Law Library has relieved the University Library to some extent. Then there is a specialised library at the Museum of Archæology, and the various Laboratories are beginning to form libraries of their own. But these developments merely transfer the burden from one part of the University to another. The Colleges must come in and help. That they should do so has long been the intention of the Legislature, as may be seen by reference to the Act of 1877 [Clause 18, (4)], which empowered the Commissioners to frame Statutes whereby the Colleges, under certain conditions, could hand over the whole or portions of their libraries to the University. This is a power which the Commissioners never exercised. The Colleges ought also to spend so much a year in providing books, as agreed on with the central authority, each College Library to be open at proper hours to duly accredited students.

Some drastic changes will have to be made before this scheme could become effective. The housing of a continually increasing number of books is always a problem. The old and worthless must be sacrificed to the new, as the new in their turn will have to be to the newer. The shelves of the University and College Libraries are cumbered with books which are never moved from their places except when they are dusted. Suppose a time limit were enacted, and all books were removed that had not been read or consulted for a hundred years. It would provide a large amount of valuable space. Then there must be in these eighteen libraries many duplicates. The superfluous volumes could be sold or otherwise disposed of, and so more room could be found.

The Royal Commissioners of 1850 were of opinion that the privilege which the Copyright Act gives to the University might be advantageously commuted for a money payment to be expended in the purchase of such books as might be deemed worth preserving.¹ There is

¹ *Report*, p. 129.

grave doubt as to whether the word "advantageously" is here rightly used. A money payment is fixed, but the number of books goes on continually increasing, so that it may be better to have the books than the money. If the money payment could be made to increase with the number and value of the books published, it might be more advantageous to have the money, as it could be used in the purchase of foreign as well as of home-produced books.

The Prime Minister informed the House of Commons on its reassembling in May, 1913, after the Whitsuntide recess, that it was not the intention of the Government to advise the issue of a Royal Commission. Two widely different interpretations may be put on this announcement; the first is that the present Ministry do not think University Reform is pressing; the other is that they hold it to be so ripe for treatment that legislation is possible at once without the delay involved in the holding of a further inquiry. If I may give my own opinion, University Reform is pressing; but the issues which it raises are so many and so complicated, and have, as far as my knowledge goes, been so little discussed, that further inquiry is necessary. This would, according to precedent, take the form of a Royal Commission. Legislation would follow in due course, laying down general principles and setting up a Statutory Body to carry them out in detail. Here Parliament must avoid the mistake of past years. The Executive Commissioners of 1852, 1854 and 1877 all failed fully to carry out the intentions of the Legislature. Any fresh Executive Commission should have the lines on which it is to proceed so marked out that no falling short is possible. Then the Universities could be started once for all on a course of natural development, and the next Royal Commission be the third and the last.

SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS.

PART I. THE UNIVERSITY.

The Chancellor.

The nominal duties of the office to be abolished, the real duties to remain as at present, with extended powers of deciding appeals from the various Boards and Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor.

To be the permanent acting head of the University, chosen without restriction by the Electoral Roll, with an adequate salary and an official residence, retiring on pension when an age limit has been reached, and having a Deputy also chosen without restriction by the Electoral Roll, with salary, etc.; the Vice-Chancellor and the Deputy-Vice-Chancellor to be *ex officio* members of all Boards and Syndicates, but each Board or Syndicate to choose its own Chairman, who shall be responsible for its business.

The Council of the Senate.

To consist of the Vice-Chancellor and Deputy-Vice-Chancellor, the Chairmen of the General Board of Studies, the Financial Board, the Board of Examinations, the Board of Management and Works, and the Board of Advanced Studies and Research, *ex officio*, and eleven other members chosen from and elected by the Electoral Roll without restriction.

The Electoral Roll, or Senate.

The Electoral Roll to become the Senate, and to consist of the Senior 450 M.A.'s or persons of equal or superior degree holding University or College office, together with 50 other members co-opted on the nomination of such outside educational bodies as shall hereafter be determined on. This body to have all the legislative and administrative powers now possessed either by the Electoral Roll or the Senate.

The General Board of Studies.

To have control both of University and College teaching, in conjunction with the Special Boards in each subject; to arrange for the requisite staff, and for its payment, in conjunction with the Financial Board.

The Board of Examinations.

To have the superintendence of all Examinations, to nominate and train Examiners.

The Board of Advanced Studies and Research.

To have the superintendence of Advanced Studies, Post-Graduate Studies, and Research, and of the special funds available for these purposes, together with such additional funds as the Financial Board may vote from time to time.

The Financial Board.

To administer the University finances, to provide funds for the work of the various Boards, and to have power over capital expenditure by the Colleges.

The Board of Management and Works.

To take over and do for the Colleges in common the work now done by Bursars, Stewards and Tutors, so far as these last are concerned with money matters.

Appeals.

In the case of any disagreement between the Colleges and the Administrative Boards, or between the Administrative Boards themselves, an appeal to lie to the Chancellor, whose decision shall be final.

Finance.

The Common University Fund to be increased to not less than *one-fifth*, and not more than *one-half*, of the assessable College incomes. All University and College accounts to be publicly audited. Pensions and age limits to be attached to all University and College offices.

Conditions of Entrance.

All students to pass an examination before entrance to the University, in which Greek shall not be a compulsory subject. Distinctions of nobleman, fellow-commoner, pensioner, sizar, to be abolished. Students as a rule to enter at 18, and graduate after a three years' course.

Entrance Scholarships.

To be awarded by the University on the results of an examination held as near as possible to the date of entry.

Terms.

Ten weeks' instruction to be given in each of the three Terms.

Degrees.

The B.A. degree to be abolished and the M.A. substituted for it.

Application of Savings.

The money saved by the grouping of the Colleges, the centralising of the administrative work, the co-ordination of the teaching, the abolition of Fellowship emoluments, and the reduction in the value of Scholarships, to be applied, under statutory obligation, to

- (1) The reduction of the cost of a University career by reducing or abolishing all fees, dues, and charges for tuition ;
- (2) The payment of adequate salaries with pensions ;
- (3) The institution of a Reserve Fund ;
- (4) The endowment of Research and the extension and improvement of University teaching ;
- (5) The training of teachers and examiners ;
- (6) The provision of University Scholarships for intending teachers, physicians and surgeons ;
- (7) University Extension.

PART II. THE COLLEGES.

The Colleges to be grouped according to the scheme already laid down. Each group to govern itself under one working Head, in accordance with a scheme framed by itself, embodying the administrative reforms already outlined, and approved by a Statutory Authority, or in default of such a scheme, under a scheme framed by the Statutory Authority itself; and to provide the share of instruction laid upon it by the General Board of Studies.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES.

- ALLBUTT, Sir CLIFFORD. *Notes on Composition of Scientific Papers.*
- CAMPION, Rev. W. M. *Cambridge Essays*, 1858.
- COOPER. *Annals of Cambridge.*
- COPLESTON, Bp. *Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review.*
- CURZON, Earl. *Principles and Methods of University Reform.*
- Dictionary of National Biography.*
- DONALDSON, Dr. *Classical Scholarship and Classical Learning.*
- Edinburgh Review.* Vols. XI., XIV., XV., XVII., LII., LIII., LIV., LX.
- [GRANT, A. R.] *The Next Step.*
- GRAY, A., M.A. *Jesus College.*
- HAMILTON, Sir WILLIAM. *Discussions* (Second Edition).
- HANSARD. *Parliamentary Debates.*
- JEBB, Dr. Quoted by Dr. Whewell, in *Of a Liberal Education.*
- LYELL, Sir CHARLES. *Travels in North America.*
- MOLESWORTH, W. N. *History of England.*
- MORLEY, Lord. *Life of Gladstone.*
- MULLINGER, J. B. *The University of Cambridge.*
- NEWMAN, Cardinal. *The Idea of a University.*
Historical Sketches.
- PATTISON, MARK. *Suggestions on Academic Organization.*
Essays on the Endowment of Research.
- PEACOCK, Rev. GEORGE. *Observations on the Statutes.*
- PRICE, Prof. BONAMY. *Suggestions for the Extension of Professorial*
Teaching in the University of Oxford.
Oxford Reform.
- Quarterly Review*, April, 1906.
- Report of the Royal Commission of 1850: Cambridge.
- Report of the Royal Commission of 1850: Oxford.
- Report of the Royal Commission of 1872: Oxford and Cambridge.
- Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1895.
- Report of the Royal Commission on University Education in London, 1913.
- Report of the University Reform Committee, Cambridge.
- SMITH, Prof. GOLDWIN. *Reorganization of the University of Oxford.*
- TENNYSON, CHARLES. *Cambridge from Within.*
- VENN, J. A. *Oxford and Cambridge Matriculations.*
Statistical Chart.
- WHEWELL, Dr. WILLIAM. *Of a Liberal Education.*
Study of Mathematics.
- WRATISLAW, A. H., M.A. *Observations on the Cambridge System.*

INDEX.

ABERDEEN, Earl of 133
 Accounts 223
 Act of Uniformity 201
 Acts of Parliament 10, 204
 Advowsons 221, 222
 Africa, South 340
 Albert, Prince, Chancellor of Cambridge University 105, 106
 Allbutt, Sir Clifford 373
 Anatomy 72
 Apparatus 222
 Arnold, Rev. T., of Rugby 92
 Arnold, Matthew 260
 Articles, the Thirty-nine 30, 59, 146, 152, 201
 Arts and Faculties 3, 9
 Asquith, H. H., Prime Minister 380
 Auditing of Accounts 315
 Australia 341
 Awdry, Sir J. W. 144n.

BADEN-POWELL, Prof. 107
 Baines, Rt. Hon. M. T. 153
 Bateson, Rev. W. H. 112, 206
 Bellamy, Dr. James 219
 Benefices 267; presentation to 221, 222
 Beresford-Hope, A. J., M.P. 103
 Bernard, Dr. Montagu 219
 Bible Clerks 9
 Blackburn, Lord 348
 Blakesley, Rev. J. W. 326, 363
 Boards of Studies: General 231-232; Special 230
 Boards of Faculties 234
 Borrowing powers 223, 315
 Bouverie, Rt. Hon. E. P. 151, 219
 Bright, John, M.P. 144, 200
 Brougham, Lord 60, 198
 Buildings 222; extension of 227

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY:—
 A Lay Corporation 1
 Appeals 382
 Auditors 307
 B.A. Examination 101
 Board of Examinations 345, 368, 382
 Board of Management and Works 382

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—*cont.*
 Board of Advanced Studies and Research 345, 376, 377, 382
 Board of Studies, General 118, 323, 324, 329, 382
 Boards of Studies, Special 117-120, 323, 324, 370
 Borrowing powers 315
 Buildings 354
 Bursars and Treasurers 307, 309, 311
 Bye-Fellowships 123, 124, 155
 Capitation Charge 271, 360
Caput Senatus 11, 12, 113, 153
 Career Scholarships 335
 Cartwright, Thomas 10
 Caution Money 360
 Celibacy 124
 Central Board 312
 Chancellor 5, 342, 381
 Chaplains, Catechists, Readers 307
 Civil Service 330
 Classics 358, 362
 'Close' Fellowships and Scholarships 112
 College Clubs 356
 College Laboratories 296
 College Lectures 324
 College Libraries 378
 Combination of Colleges 313, 321
 Commission, Report of Royal 1, 11 n., 67, 112-132, 333, 338
 Common University Fund 228-229, 274, 285, 312, 382
 Contributions of Colleges 285
 Council of Senate 343, 347, 349, 381
 Council of Studies 130-131
 Cram, to avoid 373
 Day Training College 353
 Degrees 353, 383
 Demonstrators 354
 Deans and Sub-Deans 307
 Deputy Vice-Chancellor 343
 Diplomas 353
 Directors and Supervisors of Studies 307
 Disputations 113
 Divinity Degrees 304
 Electoral Roll 154, 262, 345, 347, 348, 350, 351, 381
 Entrance Examination 363, 364, 365, 366, 373, 383

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—*cont.*

Entrance Scholarships 358, 383
 Estates, College 310-311
 Exhibitions 155, 356, 357, 359
 Fees 355, 360, 383
 Federation 340
 Fellowships 79, 123, 129, 155, 281, 330, 337, 339
 Fellows, election of 123, 129
 Financial Board 316, 345, 382
 General Examination 368, 374
 Graces 5, 113
 Greek, compulsory 349
 Grouping of Colleges 328, 384
 Halls 126, 359
 Head-masters' Conference 346
 History 358, 362
 Holy Orders 124
 Honours 300
 Hostels 126, 359, 360
 House Property 269, 312
 Income of University 282
 Incomes of Colleges 274-277, 279-281
 Incorporated 1
 Inter-Collegiate Lectures 317
 Jesus College 225
 Junior Optimes 36
 King's 7, 16; Undergraduate Fellows of 107
 Law 152
 Lectures 323
 Lecturers, College 79, 307
 Lecturers, University 116, 117, 282, 354
 Lectureships 122, 329, 330; Senior and Junior 340
 Legislative Assembly 350
 Library 128, 378; Reading-room at 128, 378
 Librarians 307
 Local Examinations 101, 364
 Masters, Vice-Masters, Presidents 307, 340
 Mathematics 4, 38, 39, 358, 362
 Matriculation 352, 360
 Medicine 152, 336; Degrees in 353
 Memorandum of Resident Fellows to Mr. Gladstone 206-207; Mr. Gladstone's Reply 207-208
 Memorial to Senate 261; recommendations rejected 263
 Modern Languages 362
 Moderators 4, 32, 33, 35
 Music, Degrees in 353
 National Education 351
 National Union of Teachers 346
 Natural Sciences 362

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—*cont.*

Non-Collegiate Students 126, 135, 356, 360
 Non-Regents 5, 44, 112
 Non-Regent House 11, 113, 114
 Non-resident Fellows 80, 129, 334
 Officers' Training Corps 353
 Organisation 342
 Organists and Choirmasters 307
 Pass Examinations 374
 Pensionaries 126
 Physwick Hostel 126
 Poll Degrees 301
 Previous Examination 365, 368, 374
 Prize Fellowships 281, 333, 334, 335
 Prizes, University 376
 Proctors 6, 34, 35, 114
 Professors 78, 114, 117, 122, 282, 377
 Professorships 121-123, 329, 340, 354
 Readers, University 282, 354
 Readerships 329
 Reform Committee 349
 Regent House 11, 112
 Regents 5, 12, 44, 49
 Registry 131, 307
 Research 334, 336-337, 375, 376, 377
 Reserve Fund 383
 Residence defined 348
 Resident Fellows 334
 Scholarships 129, 155, 356, 357-358, 360, 362, 376, 383
 Scholarship Examinations 361
 Science 279, 358
 Scrutators 11, 114
 Senate 6, 112, 262, 347, 349, 350; Non-resident members of 346
 Sextumviri 12
 Special Examinations 368, 369, 374
 Squire Law Library 379
 Statistical Tables 269, 270, 273, 274, 275, 276, 297, 298, 300, 301, 303, 378
 Stewards 307, 313
 Stocks 274, 316
 Studentships 376
 Sub-Professorships 340
 Teachers, University 283, 354
 Terms 383
 Tests 126, 128; abolition of 225, 349
 Theology 152

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY—*cont.*

Tripos: Mathematical 17, 20, 353, 369-370; Law 353, 370, 371, 372; Classical 20, 319, 353, 368, 370, 371, 377; Moral Sciences 105, 128, 353, 370; Natural Sciences 105, 128, 353; Theological 353, 369; Historical 353; Oriental Languages 353; Economics 353; Anthropological 353
 Tuition Fees 271, 383
 Tuition Fund 281
 Tutors 78, 79, 115, 307, 308
 Unattached Students 125
 Undergraduates at Cambridge Colleges 297
 University Chest 273
 Vice-Chancellor 5, 342, 343, 381
 Women, Degrees for 349, 351
 Wranglers 36
 Cambridge in 1800 17
 Cambridge Reform Committee, Report of 262-263, 320-322, 345, 354-356
 Cambridge University Bill 151, 217
Cambridge University Calendar 297 n.
Cambridge University Reporter 297 n., 323-324
 Camden, Marquis 60
 Campion, Rev. W. M. 62 n., 85 n., 105 n., 159
 Canada 341
 Canning, Viscount 146
 Capitation charges 270-271
 Carlingford, Lord 217
 Carnarvon, Earl of 216
 Cavendish, Lord Frederick 206
 Caution Money 272-273
 Cecil, Sir William 10-11
 Celibacy 9, 14, 144
 Chancellor 5, 163
 Chapel, attendance at 205
 Charles II. 201
 Chemistry 72, 230
 Christie, W. D., M.P. 102, 199
 Church and State 10, 63
 Cleveland, Duke of 206, 212
 Clinton, Lord 206
 Cockburn, Lord Chief Justice 219, 348
 Coleridge, Sir J. T. 144 n.
 Coleridge, Sir J. D. 201
 Collections 222
 Colleges 6, 48; foundation 17; compared with monasteries 8; revenues 213, 223; combination 224; income 226

Common University Fund 228-229, 234
 Congregation 140, 141, 144, 147
 Contributions from Colleges 142, 226
 Cooper 1 n., 13, 106, 113 n., 130 n., 198-199, 305, 363
 Copleston, Bp. 20, 21, 25-26, 27, 28, 29-32, 46, 60, 83-84
 Corruption 51
 Curzon, Earl 67, 233-261, 283-289, 295, 296, 308, 309, 311, 313-315, 318, 322, 327, 347, 350, 358, 363

DAMPIER, J. L. 107
 Degrees 3, 16, 44, 55, 58
 Derby, Earl of 133, 199-200
 Dickson, J. H. D. 354
 Dilke, Sir Charles, M.P. 217, 218
 Disputations 4, 332
 Dissenters 37, 51, 52, 58, 143, 144, 146, 153, 200, 202
 Divinity Degrees 198, 225, 304
 Doctors 48
 Donaldson, Dr. 67, 81-82, 98, 363
 Donaldson, Rev. S. A. 347-349
 Duncannon, Lord 60

Edinburgh Review 20, 21-25, 26, 37, 38 n., 69
 Edgeworth, R. L. 24
 Education, Government scheme 294
 Edward VI. 201
 Elementary Schools 244
 Elizabeth, Queen 201
 Ellesmere, Earl of 144 n.
 Emoluments 221, 222
 Endowment 221
 Espriella, Don Manuel 21
 Esquire Bedells 6, 113
 Estates 227, 266
 Examinations for Degrees 4, 20, 58
 Executive Commission proposed by Mr. Gladstone 137
 Exhibitions 220, 266
 Expenditure 272

FACULTIES 3, 9, 43, 44, 63
 Fawcett, Prof. 201
 Federalism 293
 Fellows 46; non-resident 9
 Fellow-commoners 34, 57
 Fellowships 134, 142, 144, 214, 267, 332, 333
 Financial Board 229

Financial resources 264-291
 Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond 201
 Foundations 265, 267

GIBSON, Milner, M.P. 199
 Gilbert, W. S. 242
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., M.P.
 101, 108, 133, 135, 136, 137, 138,
 144, 145, 148, 150, 198, 202, 203,
 205-206, 206-207, 207-208, 217,
 218, 236, 264
 Gog and Magog 22
 Gore, Bp. (of Oxford) 233, 241,
 248, 358
 Goschen, Rt. Hon. G. J., M.P.
 202, 218
 Governing Body 234
 Graham, Bp. (of Chester) 112, 153
 Grammar 3, 58
 Gray, A. 225, 304
 Groups of Colleges 299
 Grove, Dr. William 219

HALLS 48 See CAMBRIDGE, OX-
 FORD

Hamilton, Sir William 17n., 28,
 37, 38-57, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 84,
 92, 102n., 131, 150, 154, 162,
 254, 296, 326

Hardy, Rt. Hon. Gathorne, M.P.
 218

Hatherton, Lord 60

Heads of Houses, privileges 11, 49

Heathcote, Sir William 145, 148

Hemming, G. W. 219

Herschell, Sir John 112

Heywood, James, M.P. 103, 108,
 143, 144, 146, 153, 156, 199, 200

Hinds, Bp. (of Norwich) 107

Hodgson, K.D. 206

Holland, Lord 60, 198

Holy Orders 218

Hostels 1n., 7 See CAMBRIDGE,
 OXFORD

House Property 266, 269

Howley, Abp. 59

IDLE Fellowships 214

Illegality 51

Income of Universities and Col-
 leges 269, 298

Inglis, Sir Robert 103

Innes, H. McLeod 262

JAMES, I. 13, 152, 201

Jeffrey, Lord 20

Jervis, Sir John, Attorney-General
 105

Jesuits 102n.

Jeune, Dr. 107

Johnson, Rev. G. H. S. 107

Jowett, Dr. Benjamin 101, 110,
 136, 137, 240, 241, 260

KEBBEL, T. E. 27

LABORATORIES 229, 296

Lady Margaret 5

Lands 266, 268

Latin 4, 9, 31, 149

Laud, Abp. 13, 48, 49, 51

Law 3, 63

Leases, beneficial 224, 268

Lecture rooms 229

Lecturers 11 See CAMBRIDGE,
 OXFORD

Lectureships 142, 220, 221, 266

Legislation 198-232

Legislative interference 162

Leicester, Robert Dudley, Earl of,
 13, 51, 62, 201

Libraries 222, 229

Liddell, Dr. H. G. 107

Lightfoot, Prof. (Bp. of Durham)
 219

Logic 58

Longley, Abp. 144n.

Lonsdale, Bp. (of Lichfield) 153

Louvain 47

Lowe, Rt. Hon. Robert, M.P. 101

Lyell, Sir Charles 67, 70-76

Lyndhurst, Lord 153, 156

Lytton, Lord 60

MAGISTRATES of the University 50

Mary, Queen 201

Masters 7, 44, 48

Mathematics 4, 17, 58

Medicine 3, 63

Melancthon 102n.

Melbourne, Viscount 60, 198

Merivale, Dean 326, 363, 367-
 368

Miall, Edward, M.P. 143, 200

Molesworth 104

Monasteries, Dissolution of 265

Morley, Earl of 216

Morley, Lord 101, 106, 136, 143,
 145

Morgan, Osborne, M.P. 217

Mullinger, J. B. 2, 3, 5, 7

Museums 229

NATURAL Sciences 55, 58, 72, 296
 Newcastle, Duke of 17
 Newman, Cardinal 19-20, 37, 51,
 67, 69, 85, 87 n., 94-97, 292, 363
 Newton, Sir Isaac 17, 64; his
Principia 35, 40
Next Step, The 77
 Noblemen 57
 Nonconformists 62, 63, 160, 204
 Non-resident Fellows 15, 79
 Non-resident voters 14

OATH of Supremacy 152
 O'Connell, Daniel 198
 Oral teaching 4
 Ordination, compulsory 144
 OXFORD UNIVERSITY:—
 Accounts 285
 Amalgamation of Colleges 179,
 183, 245
 Ancient House of Congregation
 236
 Annual payment to University
 270
 Architecture 190
 Architect, University 259
 Art 190
 As it is 53
 As it might be 54
 Balance-sheet, University and
 Colleges 284
 Balliol 53
 Biological Sciences 179, 183
 Board of Education 196
 Board of Examinations 184
 Board of Faculties 256, 257
 Board of Finance 289-291
 Bodleian Library 285
 Business Education 254
 Caution Money 246
 Celibacy 110
 Chemistry 72, 179
 Christ Church 53, 62
 Clarendon Press 24, 260, 288
 Classics 4, 190, 193, 250
 Clerk of Works 259
 'Close' Fellowships and Scholar-
 ships 158
 College Statutes 258
 Commission, Report of Royal 1,
 15, 67, 107-112, 264
 Common University Fund 260,
 288
 Congregation 44, 48, 49, 111, 147,
 164, 197, 217, 235, 344
 Constitution 164-167, 235
 Contributions of Colleges 150
 Convocation 6, 44, 48, 49, 73,
 147, 165, 237-241, 344

OXFORD UNIVERSITY—*cont.*
 Corpus 62
 Council, University 234
 Curators of the Chest 259
 Delegacy 195
 Diplomas 366
 Dues 246
 Engineering 190
 English Tongue in Congregation
 149
 Endowments 166-175, 234
 Entrance Examination 194, 235
 Estates, Management of 287
 Examinations 92, 184-185, 252
 Examination Statute 100
 Exhibitions 169, 170, 234, 247,
 248
 Faculties 181-183, 188, 194, 257
 Fees 246
 Fellows 87, 88
 Fellowships 110, 172-173, 192,
 234
 Financial Board proposed 166
 'Greats' 188
 Greek in Responsions 235, 252
 Halls, Public and Private 149,
 243
 Headships 192, 280
 Hebdomadal Board 73, 111, 140,
 158
 Hebdomadal Council 140, 141,
 144, 147, 164, 214, 235, 260, 288
 History 183, 186
 Honorary Degrees 261
 Honours Degree 184
 Hostels 243
 House Property 269
 Incomes of Colleges 277-278
 Inter-Collegiate instruction 185,
 256
 James I. 196
 Keble College, meals in common
 245
 Laboratories 193, 260
 Language and Literature 190
 Law 186, 190, 194
 Lecturers 190, 193
 Lectureships 111
 Legislative Assembly 194
 Libraries 260
 Local Examination Delegacy 253
 M.A. Degree 240
 Mathematics 190, 193
 Mathematical and Experimental
 Sciences 183, 190
 Matriculations 189, 366
 Medicine 190, 194
 Moderations 4, 186, 188, 189
 Moral and Mental Sciences 183
 Music, Degrees in 366

OXFORD UNIVERSITY—*cont.*

Natural Science 193
 New College 7, 16, 107
 Non-Collegiate Students 110, 242-243
 Organisation 254
 Pass Degree 184, 253-254
 Pass Examinations 184, 194
 Pattison's Scheme 181-185
 Pension Fund 261
 Poor Men 241-242
 Prælectorships 109
 Prize Fellowships 192
 Prize Scholarships 169, 170, 249
 Professors 87-89, 91, 109, 193, 255
 Professorships 111
 Redistribution of Endowment Fund 175-181
 Registrar 259
 Research 90, 260, 366
 Responsions 4, 365, 366
 Scholarships 110, 169, 189, 234, 247, 248
 Schools, Inspection and Examination of 253
 Seminars 260
 Statutes, 150
 Studies, conflict of 186-188; arrangement of 189-191
 Subsidies to Education 167-172
 Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Schools 244, 250
 Tests 158
 Theology 190
 Tuition Fees 271
 Tutors 86-87, 190, 193
 Unattached Students 171, 255
 University Extension 234, 241, 243
 Vice-Chancellor 195, 259
 Visitation 196
 Visitors 196
 Women, Degrees for 261
 Working Classes 242
 Working Men's Colleges 234, 244, 250
 Oxford in 1800 17
Oxford University Gazette 236 n., 289-291

PALMER, Roundell (Lord Selborne) 104, 219
 Palmerston, Lord 103, 133-135, 198
 Paris University 2, 47
 Parker, Abp. 11
 Patronage 58

Pattison, Mark 61-62, 67, 98-99, 102 n., 109, 148, 157-159, 162-191, 197, 208-211, 239 n., 241, 260, 264, 292, 294, 298, 299 n., 308, 310, 327, 332-333, 337, 354, 357, 360
 Peacock, Dean 13, 64, 72, 80, 112, 153
 Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir L. 153
 Peel, Sir Robert 202
 Pensioners 57
 Pension Fund 55
 Pensions 220
 Perjury 51, 52
 Peter Lombard 2, 3
 Philosophy 58
 Phillimore, Lord Chief Justice 137
 Philpott, Bp. (of Worcester) 219
 Playfair, Prof. 20, 23 n.
 Poetic 58
 Politics 30, 58
 Prælectors 8
 Preparatory School 101
 Price, Prof. Bonamy 57, 67, 85-94, 131 n.
 Price, Bartholomew 206
 Price, L. L. 277 n., 280, 311
 Prizes 220
 Proctors 6, 7
 Professorial and Tutorial Teaching compared 56-57
 Professorial System 66, 69, 70
 Professoriate 5, 18, 45
 Professors 45, 72, 73, 74, 78
 Professorships 142, 220, 221, 266
 Property 268-270
 Pryme, Professor, M.P. for the Borough of Cambridge 60, 61, 113 n.
 Psychology 58
 Public Schools 101, 358
 Puritans 10
 Pusey, Dr. E. B. 85

QUADRIVIUM 3, 4
Quarterly Review 278-280, 310, 331, 334
 Queen's Speech 211, 217
 Questionists 6, 34

RADNOR, Earl of 59, 60, 198, 199
 Rayleigh, Lord 206, 219
 Redesdale, Earl of 219
 Reformation 16
 Regius Professors 5, 18
 Residence 15; defined 348
 Responsions 4
 Restoration 16
 Rhetoric 30, 58

- Ridley, M. W. 219
 Ripon, Marquis of 202
 Romilly, Sir John, Attorney-General 112
 Roundell, C. S. 206
 Royal Charter 1
 Royal Commission (1872), Oxford and Cambridge, Report of 264-273
 Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1895, Report of 330n., 351n.
 Royal Commission on University Education in London, Report of 342n.
 Royal Letters Patent 1
 Russell, Lord John 104, 105, 133, 136, 138-143, 145, 150, 159, 198, 229, 236
- SALAMANCA 21
 Salisbury, Marquis of 202, 203, 211-216, 217, 298
 Scholars 8
 Scholarships 142, 220, 221, 244, 266, 267
 Secondary Education 294; Royal Commission on 351n.; Grant for 360
 Secondary Schools 356, 365
 Sedgwick, Prof. Adam 112
 Selborne, Lord 104, 219
 Sewell, Rev. William 67
 Smith, Prof. Goldwin 10, 13-15, 63, 67, 97, 107, 144n., 191-196, 197, 310, 327
 Smith, Prof. H. J. S. 219
 Smith, Rev. J. J. 363
 Smith, Rev. Sydney 20
Sophista Generalis 29
 Stanley, Lord 153
 Stanley, Rev. A. P. 107, 143
 Statutes: Laudian 13, 44, 62; Founders' 59; Elizabethan 80, 82; new 273
 Stephen, Sir Leslie 65, 67
 Stipends 229
 Stokes, Prof. 219
 Stocks and Shares 266, 269
 Stuart, John, M.P. 106
 Subscription 59, 198-199
 Summerhill, Lord 60
- TAIT, Abp. 107, 216, 359
 Teacherships 266
 Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools 244
 Temple, Abp. 101
 Tennyson, Charles 302
 Terms 226
 Tests 112, 142, 151, 199, 200, 201-204, 225
 Theology 3, 63
 Thring, Lord Henry 137
 Tithe Rent Charges 266, 269
 Treason 51
Trivium 3, 4
 Tripos: See CAMBRIDGE
 Trusts 215, 266
 Tutorial System 45, 47, 65, 66, 69
 Tutors 8, 40, 46, 78
- UNATTACHED Students 212, 220, 359
 University Extension 68, 241
 University v. Colleges 42, 69-99
- VAUGHAN, Prof. H. H. 21n., 85, 109
 Vaughan, Rev. C. J. 153
 Vice-Chancellor 5, 11, 14, 49, 165, 381
 Visitors 9
- WALLIS, Dr. John 46
 Walpole, Rt. Hon. Spencer, M.P., 141, 144, 201, 217
 Wellington, Duke of, Chancellor of Oxford University 105
 Wendeborn 16
 Whewell, Dr. W. 32-36, 38, 39, 67, 75, 363
 Whitgift, Abp. 10
 Williams, Colonel 198
 Winchelsea, Earl of 146
 Wood, Sir W. P., Vice-Chancellor 153
 Wood, George, M.P. 198, 203
 Wratislaw, A. H. 78-80, 363

RL - 9 O.

DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

ST. AUGUSTINE
FLA.



32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 127 911 6